Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554

IN THE MATTER OF:

: MB Docket No. 14-82

PATRICK SULLIVAN

(Assignor) : FRN 0003749041, 0006119796,

: 0006149843, 0017196064

and

: Facility ID No. 146162

LAKE BROADCASTING, INC.

: File No. BALFT-20120523ABY (Assignee)

Application for Consent to: Assignment of License of FM: Translator Station W238CE, : Montgomery, Alabama

Volume 5

Wednesday, May 3, 2017

Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, S.W. Hearing Room TWA363 Washington, D.C. 20554

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing, pursuant to notice, at 10:30 a.m.

BEFORE:

THE HONORABLE RICHARD L. SIPPEL, Chief Administrative Law Judge

APPEARANCES:

On Behalf of Patrick Sullivan and Lake Broadcasting, Inc.:

JEROLD L. JACOBS, ESQ.

of: Law Offices of Jerold L. Jacobs

1629 K Street, N.W.

Suite 300

Washington, D.C. 20006

(202) 508-3383 (202) 331-3759 FAX

jerold.jacobs.esq@verizon.net

On Behalf of The Federal Communications Commission:

WILLIAM KNOWLES-KELLET, ESQ.

GARY A. OSHINSKY, ESQ.

of: Federal Communications Commission

Enforcement Bureau

Investigations and Hearings Division

445 12th Street, S.W.

Room 4-C330

Washington, D.C. 20554

(202) 418-1420

william.knowles-kellett@fcc.gov

gary.oshinsky@fcc.gov

CONTENTS

WITNESS	DIRECT	<u>CROSS</u>	REDIRECT	RECROSS
Michael Rice		183	328	349

	oit No.	<u>Document</u>	<u>ID'd</u>	Rec'd
Rice 1	Written Testimony		168	175
Direc 1	<u>t Case</u> Biography of Mr. Ric	e	175	177
2	Statement of status Lake Broadcasting, I		175	175
3	Letters of Character		175	
10	Second Amended Infor Charging Document Dated July 5, 1994	mation,	186	187
4	August Parole Hearin	g Report		257 except 7-10)

	162
1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	(10:29 a.m.)
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: This is a hearing, the formal
4	hearing in the case of Patrick Sullivan and Lake Broadcasting,
5	Inc. Application for Consent to Assignment. It's MB Docket
6	number 14-82. I'm going to ask the Enforcement Bureau to
7	enter their appearance on the record, please.
8	MR. OSHINSKY: Your Honor, entering our appearance,
9	Gary Oshinsky for the Enforcement Bureau.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, Mr. Oshinsky.
11	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: And William Knowles-Kellett
12	for the Enforcement Bureau.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: And for Mr. Rice?
14	MR. JACOBS: My name is Jerold L. Jacobs, and I
15	represent Patrick Sullivan, the proposed assignor of FM
16	Translator Station W238CE, and Lake Broadcasting, Inc., the
17	proposed assignee.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Which is owned and controlled by Mr.
19	Rice, is that correct?
20	MR. JACOBS: Mr. Rice is the President, sole owner,
21	and Director of Lake.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right, thank you. Okay, I have

have Mr. Michael Rice as the first witness, is that correct?

a schedule that came to my attention. Today's May 3rd.

MR. JACOBS: Yes, sir.

23

24

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. And then we're going to have
2	Dr. Ann Duncan, and then tomorrow we're going to have Ms.
3	Tamara Gremminger and Dr. Weitl. So there's only four
4	witnesses, is that correct?
5	MR. JACOBS: That's correct.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Is that right?
7	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: On Friday, Dr. Weitl. She's
8	going to fly in tomorrow afternoon.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: No, that's why, I thought I said
LO	that. But we have four witnesses.
L1	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Exactly.
L2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. We should be able to handle
L3	that. As I said before. I want to take a lunch break. If
L4	it's 10:30 now, I want to take a lunch break at 12:30, come
L5	back here at 1:30, and see how we go in the afternoon. And
L6	everybody has agreed to that. So let's get started.
L7	Mr. Jacobs, do you want to call your first witness?
L8	MR. JACOBS: I have an opening statement first,
L9	Your Honor.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: How long is it?
21	MR. JACOBS: Two minutes.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. We can do two minutes. Go
	ahead, sir. No, I'm not trying to make light of it. I mean,
24	this is I'm very time conscious.

MR. JACOBS: Okay.

JUDGE SIPPEL: But go ahead, right ahead.

1

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. JACOBS: At this hearing, Lake intends to prove that Mr. Rice's felony convictions have no continuing effect on his qualifications or the qualifications of Lake to be a licensee because Mr. Rice is fully rehabilitated from his past criminal activity, has a very low risk of re-offending, and is fully fit to become a Commission licensee again.

Lake has not operated any broadcast station since October 2001, but has remained in good standing as a Missouri corporation to While Mr. Rice is physical date. the embodiment of Lake, Lake previously disqualified was independently of Mr. Rice, Mr. Rice not held and was accountable for Lake's misrepresentation and lack of candor misconduct.

JUDGE SIPPEL: As to the Commission?

MR. JACOBS: Right. Lake is now fully fit to become a Commission licensee again. The subject assignment application should be granted. To prove these points, Lake presents three direct case exhibits and two witnesses.

Exhibit number 1 is a biographical statement of Mr. Rice, who will testify at the hearing. His exhibit covers his early history through the present time. It shows that he is fully rehabilitated, is involved in civic and religious activities, does occasional broadcast engineering work, is in moderately good health but suffers from diabetes and

hypertension, and has obtained seven letters of reference from long time acquaintances and business associates who all express awareness of his prior history, describe his current neighborhood or business relationship, and variously state their beliefs that Mr. Rice is honest, is respected in his community, is a changed man, has achieved extraordinary rehabilitation and good standing in his St. Charles area, and fully complies with all FCC and FAA regulations.

Lake's Exhibit 2 is a statement about the status of Lake Broadcasting, Inc., a Missouri for-profit corporation which has not operated a broadcast station since 2001 but remains in good standing as a Missouri corporation.

As its president, sole director, and 100 percent owner, Mr. Rice will testify at the hearing that he and Lake can both be relied upon to be truthful, candid, and forthcoming in the dealings with the Commission, and will comply in all other respects with the Commission's rules, regulations, and policies.

Exhibit 3, the statement and psychological reports prepared by Dr. Ann Duncan-Hively, a PhD clinical psychologist with a JD law degree, practicing psychology in Chesterfield, Missouri.

She examined Mr. Rice at length in 1991 and again in 2014 and concludes that Mr. Rice has been successfully rehabilitated, and his probability of re-offending is very

10

11

12

13

15

17

18

19

20

21

low. She will testify at the hearing that she finds no psychological basis for barring Mr. Rice from gaining a broadcast license again. He represents the epitome of the term rehabilitation.

It is vitally important, Your Honor, to put this case into proper historical context. Mr. Rice's criminal misconduct occurred between 1985 and 1990. He was arrested in 1990. His trial occurred in 1994, and he began an eight-year prison term in September 1994.

Mr. Rice obtained early release from prison on December 29, 1999 after serving just over five years of his sentence. On October 3, 2001, Mr. Rice shut down his five broadcast stations, pursuant to Commission order. In August 2002, Mr. Rice completed parole and was fully restored to all rights of citizenship including the right to vote.

Mr. Rice is now almost 76 years old. Over the last three years, he has spent tens of thousands of dollars in the current effort to become re-licensed. This is a matter of principle for him, redeeming his good name. That is the point of winning this case, not obtaining ownership of a mere \$1,000 FM translator station.

As the hearing designation order states, the crucial question in this case is whether Mr. Rice has been rehabilitated. Lake submits that this issue should be judged by examining Mr. Rice today and seeing what he has been doing

1	for the last 17 years, since his release from prison.
2	The evidence shows that he has never re-offended
3	and is a productive member of society. These are the things
4	that count. The Bureau wastes its time and hours by harping
5	on things that happened
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: No, no. No, no, you're not going
7	to say that. No wasting time.
8	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: It's crossed into argument.
9	It's no longer a statement.
LO	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, I just want to let this go a
L1	little bit longer.
L2	MR. JACOBS: I have one more sentence.
L3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Go right ahead.
L4	MR. JACOBS: Harping on things that happened 25 or
L5	more years ago. The future is now, and Mr. Rice and Lake are
L6	fully rehabilitated and have earned the right to be re-
L7	licensed. I thank you, Your Honor.
L8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Does the Bureau have anything in
L9	terms of an opening statement or some facsimile thereof?
20	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Well, Your Honor, we
21	submitted a trial brief
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: I know.
23	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: which sets out our case
24	quite concretely.
25	JUDGE SIPPEL: Fair enough.

1	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: As far as any opening
2	statement, I think we can reserve until we're ready to put on
3	our case.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Fair enough. Mr. Jacobs, I just
5	want to ask you one fact question. When is the last time that
6	Mr. Rice performed an unlawful act in connection with his
7	background? In other words, what was the last one that's
8	as a matter of record. He was arrested
9	MR. JACOBS: In November, 1990.
LO	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Was that the terminate?
L1	MR. JACOBS: Yes.
L2	JUDGE SIPPEL: All of his activities?
L3	MR. JACOBS: Yes.
L4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Completely?
L5	MR. JACOBS: Yes.
L6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. All right. So it's 1990 to
L7	today?
L8	MR. JACOBS: Yes.
L9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you. You may proceed, Mr.
20	Jacobs.
21	MR. JACOBS: Well, we now would like to call as our
22	witness Mr. Michael S. Rice. Come forward and be sworn. And
23	his direct case exhibit is Exhibit number 1 in our exhibit
24	JUDGE SIPPEL: Come forward, Mr. Rice.
25	(Whereupon, the above-referred to document was

1	marked as Rice Exhibit No. 1 for identification.)
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Is that his testimony, sworn?
3	MR. JACOBS: That's his testimony.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, we'll get him, we'll talk to
5	him about it.
6	WHEREUPON,
7	MICHAEL RICE
8	was called as a witness by Counsel for the Plaintiff and,
9	having been first duly sworn, assumed the witness stand, was
LO	examined and testified as follows:
L1	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Your Honor, as a preliminary
L2	matter, did you want to deal with what exhibits are and aren't
L3	into evidence?
L4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Not yet. Let's get this testimony
L5	first.
L6	MR. OSHINSKY: Your Honor, we would also like to
L7	ask for a rule on witnesses?
L8	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm sorry?
L9	MR. OSHINSKY: That the witnesses be excluded from
20	Mr. Rice's testimony. Sequestered, I'm sorry.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, he's got the testimony in
22	written form. Why would anybody have to be sequestered?
23	MR. OSHINSKY: All right. Is it Your Honor's
24	intention for Mr. Rice and the other witnesses to be limited
25	just to the written, direct testimony?

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, if for some reason they vary
2	from it, I'm going to have to hear from counsel, and I'm going
3	to hear from you.
4	MR. OSHINSKY: Okay, thank you.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm not expecting it to happen, but
6	you know how things go. I mean, on cross examination, he may
7	be led into another area.
8	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes, I was talking about just
9	direct.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Just direct? I'm going to assume
11	that he's going to be kept pretty close to what is written
12	out. Now this is the, I've got a set of the exhibits of, I
13	guess you're the applicant, I guess.
14	MR. JACOBS: Right.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: So you're the plaintiff, you have
16	the burden of proof?
17	MR. JACOBS: Yes.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Is there any objection to any
19	of these exhibits?
20	MR. OSHINSKY: Well, Your Honor, we do have
21	objections which were filed in the Bureau's objections to
22	direct evidence of Lake.
23	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, could you just repeat those
24	quickly?
25	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Okay, our primary objections,

1	Your Honor, the character reference letters were not prepared
2	under penalty of perjury.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: I read that one, okay.
4	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Okay, and they were submitted
5	under a declaration that's signed by Mr. Rice, not by their
6	authors.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: I hear you. Okay.
8	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: And in there is also a letter
9	without a declaration under penalty of perjury from Mr. Rice's
10	deceased psychiatrist. And we objected that that's straight
11	hearsay, he can't be, it's not a dying declaration. So we
12	think
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well he certainly can't be cross
14	examined.
15	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Exactly. So we think that
16	the conclusions in that letter can't be relied on.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right, I'll grant the last
18	request for the dead man's letter. The others, I think you
19	definitely have a point, but all these things are are letters
20	saying he's a fine, decent man. That's all they're saying.
21	I don't think there's anything controlling.
22	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Just one minute, Your Honor.
23	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, I hear it.
24	MR. OSHINSKY: Your Honor, the Bureau feels that
25	these letters actually supply a necessary element in the case,

Τ.	and so we chill it is
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: What is the element? What is that?
3	MR. OSHINSKY: Standing in the community. And that
4	is part of the test for rehabilitation. So these letters do
5	have a concrete effect. And so we
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: How long have you known about these
7	letters?
8	MR. OSHINSKY: The letters have been with us for
9	quite a while, but they've also been unsworn.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Did you ever talk to any of these
11	witnesses on the phone even?
12	MR. OSHINSKY: No, Your Honor. We did do a Lexis
13	search, in fact.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, but did you talk to the people
15	who wrote the letters?
16	MR. OSHINSKY: No, but I'm not sure that would have
17	made any difference, Your Honor.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I'm not sure either, but maybe
19	it would have. I'm 50/50 on that one. I'm going to let the
20	rest of them in. I'm not going to give a lot of weight to
21	them, but if you say that it does go to an element of the
22	case, or an issue of the case, I'm going to receive it as
23	being relevant to that, and I said they're nice endorsements

It means a lot to you, sir. But I mean,

25

24 which don't mean too much.

for

1	purposes of the legality of this case, it doesn't mean too
2	much.
3	MR. OSHINSKY: Your Honor, I would just like to
4	note that they are purely hearsay.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: They are hearsay.
6	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Do you think that hearsay is
8	admissible in an administrative case?
9	MR. OSHINSKY: Not in this case, Your Honor. We
10	don't believe that these letters fit into any exception.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, they say that we don't have
12	fast rules of evidence with respect to administrative
13	hearings. I try and be as close to them as I can, and I'm not
14	particularly happy with my ruling. Counsel should have gotten
15	about the declarations, all that should have been done.
16	I'm going to give you a chance to do it after the
17	fact, get each of these people to submit a declaration with
18	respect to whatever it is they wrote. You hear me?
19	MR. JACOBS: It's done.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: It is done now?
21	MR. JACOBS: Yes.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Do I have them?
23	MR. JACOBS: Yes.
24	JUDGE SIPPEL: They're in here, they're in your
25	book?

1	MR. JACOBS: No because they were just filed on
2	April 30th, and the Bureau has filed a motion to strike.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I am certainly going to
4	address the motion to strike. Did you file an opposition to
5	it?
6	MR. JACOBS: No, just an informal note saying that
7	
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: It was too technical and you didn't
9	want to take the time to do it. All right, well I'm going to
10	have to think about that then. But I'm still going to leave
11	it here for purposes of discussion.
12	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Okay, Your Honor, we don't
13	think the declarations cured the hearsay problem with these
14	letters. There just isn't enough in these letters to make
15	them reliable.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: There is no way of curing the
17	hearsay aspect of these letters without the witnesses being
18	here in court.
19	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Okay.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Nobody's brought them in. You
21	haven't taken their depositions. You've had these letters a
22	while. There's an element of waiver here, too. I mean, you
23	know, well anyway. I'm going to take a look again at the
24	written points in the motion, and I'll address those. But
25	right now I'm treating this as, I'm going to treat those

1	letters as exhibits, subject to my final ruling.
2	MR. OSHINSKY: Thank you, Your Honor.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. They're conditionally in, in
4	other words. Any other objections?
5	MR. OSHINSKY: No, other than what Knowles-Kellett
6	mentioned, no.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Then subject to my ruling
8	with respect to the character letters, his exhibits, Mr. Rice
9	exhibits, Lake Broadcasting Exhibits, what are they numbered,
10	A, B, C, D?
11	MR. JACOBS: Those are the appendices, yes.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, what am I going to call these?
13	I have to have a number for these things, A through B or
14	something?
15	MR. JACOBS: I did one.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, I see, okay. Exhibit 1 with
17	Appendix what, A?
18	MR. JACOBS: A, B, C, and D.
19	(Whereupon, the above-referred to document was
20	marked as Direct Case Exhibit No. 1 for identification.)
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: D, okay. That's right. And then
22	we've got Exhibit 2 with Appendix A, is that correct?
23	MR. JACOBS: A and B.
24	JUDGE SIPPEL: And B, right, right.
25	(Whereupon, the above-referred to document was

1	marked as Direct Case Exhibit No. 2 for identification.)
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: And then we have Exhibit 3 with
3	Appendix A, B, C, and then we have a certificate of service.
4	(Whereupon, the above-referred to document was
5	marked as Direct Case Exhibit No. 3 for identification.)
6	MR. JACOBS: Right.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Well, all the exhibits
8	that have been identified are identified for the record, and
9	they're received into evidence subject to the ruling, final
10	ruling on the documents we've talked about.
11	Okay. All right, we'll get to the Bureau's
12	exhibits at the appropriate time. But I'm going to ask you,
13	Mr. Jacobs, to look at these exhibits again and as I say, I've
14	given you something, give me something, if you can. If you
15	can live with it. Do you hear me?
16	MR. JACOBS: Well I, we supplied declarations.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: I know, I know. I'm not arguing
18	with you. Look, what I'm saying is I've been very liberal in
19	treating your imperfect exhibits. And I want you to look
20	again at the Bureau exhibits, and maybe some of the objections
21	you've had, you can reconsider. That's all I'm asking.
22	MR. JACOBS: Okay, well when we look at those
23	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's all I'm asking, don't worry
24	about it. Yes is good enough.
25	MR. JACOBS: I'll be happy to

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes is fine with me. Okay, let's
2	begin with this witness. Your witness.
3	MR. JACOBS: We move the admission of Direct Case
4	Exhibit number one which is Mr. Rice's biographical statement.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Any objection?
6	MR. OSHINSKY: No, Your Honor.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, it's in.
8	(Whereupon, the above-referred to document was
9	received into evidence as Direct Case Exhibit No. 1.)
LO	JUDGE SIPPEL: Let me see. Oh, there it is. Page
L1	2, rehabilitation, 1999 to the present. I'm asking these
L2	questions on voir dire, and then I'm going to turn him over
L3	to you to testify. You understand that?
L4	MR. JACOBS: It was my understanding that as soon
L5	as the exhibit was admitted, Mr. Rice would be open to cross
L6	and I wouldn't have to, I mean, he's not going to read his
L7	exhibit aloud.
L8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Well I would like to set a
L9	few questions. I didn't expect to hear him, I wasn't even
20	hinting that that was going to be the case. But anyway, let
21	me ask you this question.
22	You say on Page 2 on your rehabilitation, upon
	release from prison in 1999, et cetera, Mr. Rice moved from
	his previous home in St. Louis County to St. Charles County
) 5	where he hought a home in a regidential subdivision. Now what

1	was the purpose of that move?
2	THE WITNESS: We had leased the house in St. Louis
3	County and we gave up the lease, and then I moved to, when I
4	was released to prison to St. Charles County, to that house.
5	That was the reason.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, was that, was the St. Charles
7	County house, was that your permanent home?
8	THE WITNESS: Yes. Well, no, not then. But it is
9	now.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I'm still asking the question
11	again. Why move, it was a lease. Was the lease expiring?
12	THE WITNESS: It had expired.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: On this, okay, on the St. Louis
14	property.
15	THE WITNESS: Correct.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: So you moved because the lease was
17	up?
18	THE WITNESS: No, I was actually still
19	incarcerated, and I moved into the home of my present home in
20	1999.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's what it says here.
22	THE WITNESS: Yes.
23	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. But you did not own the home

No.

25

at that time, in 1999?

THE WITNESS:

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Did you buy it now, it's your
2	home?
3	THE WITNESS: I inherited it.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, that's good. Well, that's one
5	step better than buying. Okay, now I want to ask you did you
6	register as a sex offender in the area of your new home?
7	THE WITNESS: Yes.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. And you are still registered
9	that way?
10	THE WITNESS: Yes.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Now the only reason I'm
12	asking that question is because I want to see what your
13	appreciation is of your legal obligations. So I'm not trying
14	to make any other issue than that of it. Okay, let me just
15	look at this. I'm pretty much finished.
16	Oh, here's one yet. On Page 1 and 2, immediately
17	in April 1991 began voluntary hospitalization of six months
18	for psychiatric evaluation at the Barnes Hospital in St.
19	Louis. Who paid for that psychiatric evaluation?
20	THE WITNESS: Insurance and myself.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. That's fine. And the same
22	paragraph, as of the time of his incarceration, all of Mr.
23	Rice's conditions were in remission as a result of his
24	treatment. What do you mean by in remission? Doesn't that
25	apply to cancer?

1	THE WITNESS: Well, I'm not a doctor. I'm not sure
2	how to
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm not either, yes. So I don't
4	know what you meant by in remission.
5	THE WITNESS: I guess remission means that you
6	don't have the mental problems that I had previously is what
7	I believe that would mean.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's what you intended it to mean?
9	THE WITNESS: In this, yes.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: There's no trick question, that's
11	okay. Let me see. And again, your successful completion of
12	a 12 month Missouri sexual offender program, again, how was
13	that paid for?
14	THE WITNESS: The State of Missouri.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: They paid for that?
16	THE WITNESS: The state, and it's done while you're
17	incarcerated, and it's a condition, you have to complete it
18	in order to get parole.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, those are the taxpayers of
20	Missouri that are paying for that.
21	THE WITNESS: Yes.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Not a bad deal. Okay. All right,
23	I don't have any other questions. Wait just a minute. Let's
24	see. Here, I'm on Page 4, I got ahead of myself here. Mr.
25	Rice is fully recovered and rehabilitated from his psychiatric

1	condition. That's from Dr. Stillings. It's a psychiatric
2	condition, psychiatric condition?
3	THE WITNESS: Yes.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: The bipolar end of it?
5	THE WITNESS: Yes, I think there were several other
6	diagnoses he had. But
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Well I'm going to get into,
8	we'll get into that. But and you also have diabetes?
9	THE WITNESS: Yes.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: You know, Wellbutrin does not
11	naturally go very well with diabetes.
12	THE WITNESS: No, I take other medicine for that.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: But not for the diabetes. Yes,
14	that's the trouble. You take one medicine, another medicine
15	to cure what is bad about that medicine. I understand that.
16	Let me see. It is his opinion to a reasonable degree of
17	medical psychiatric certainty, and that's Dr. Stillings, that
18	Mr. Rice is qualified for FCC licensure. Now what the heck
19	does the doctor know about FCC licensure?
20	THE WITNESS: Beats me, I don't know.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right, well that's two of us
22	that are beaten. I mean, I'm not going to give any credence
23	to that sentence. Mr. Rice's primary care physician is now
24	Dr. Kramer, an internist in an, okay, that's irrelevant.
25	Okay, he's fully recovered and rehabilitated from

1	his psychiatric condition. Does that mean your condition that
2	at one time it moved you to assault children?
3	THE WITNESS: Yes.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Is that a fair question?
5	THE WITNESS: Yes.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: I mean, you already served time for
7	that so you don't need a 5th Amendment. I hope not. And
8	again, we find no psychological reason that Mr. Rice should
9	not merit the reconsideration of his license status. Well,
10	that is totally, he's totally unqualified to make that
11	statement. Is that a she or a he? That's Dr. Anne L. Duncan-
12	Hively.
13	So same goes for her as goes for the other doctor,
14	they can't qualify, they can't characterize your success in
15	treatment and tie that in with your capable of operating under
16	a license. Okay, that's all I have.
17	Oh, one more question. I'm sorry, one more. Were
18	any letters of reference, any character letters sought from
19	any of those people that you had abused?
20	THE WITNESS: No.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Is there a reason for that?
22	THE WITNESS: I don't know where they're at. It
23	was so long ago that I have not had any contact.
24	JUDGE SIPPEL: Did you ever apologize to them or
25	THE WITNESS. I did in open court at the time of

1	the sentence.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: But I mean, did you ever personally
3	contact them say by letter or by telephone, telegraph?
4	THE WITNESS: No.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Email?
6	THE WITNESS: No because
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: You were prevented from doing that
8	by the Court. You had a court order
9	THE WITNESS: Yes.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: don't do that.
11	THE WITNESS: You cannot contact the victims or
12	witnesses.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: That makes sense, okay. I take that
14	question back. That's all I have.
15	MR. OSHINSKY: We have a few, Your Honor.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, I know you do. I hope you do.
17	CROSS EXAMINATION
18	MR. OSHINSKY: Good morning, Mr. Rice.
19	THE WITNESS: Good morning, Mr. Oshinsky.
20	BY MR. OSHINSKY:
21	Q Can I ask you, are you the one who wrote your
22	direct testimony that the Counsel's Exhibit has put into
23	evidence?
24	A No.
25	Q Who wrote it?

1	A Mr. Jacobs.
2	Q Mr. Rice, you're here today to ask the Judge and
3	the Commission to grant your application for a new FM
4	translator station, is that correct?
5	A Yes.
6	Q And as a part of that request you're asking the
7	Judge and the Commission find that you're rehabilitated from
8	the crimes of deviant sexual assault and sodomy that you
9	committed against five children back in 1991, correct?
LO	A Yes.
L1	Q You're also asking the Commission and the Judge to
L2	find that you're rehabilitated from your misrepresentation and
L3	your lack of candor to the Commission concerning your running
L4	of contemporary media in your other broadcasting companies
L5	back in 2001 I believe?
L6	A I made no misrepresentations.
L7	Q So you're not here to ask for rehabilitation from
L8	that?
L9	A I don't know how to answer that.
20	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes or no.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Why can't you answer that question?
22	THE WITNESS: Would you repeat the question so
23	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's the best way to get out of
24	it.
25	MR. OSHINSKY: You're also here to ask the

1	Commission and the Judge to find that you're rehabilitated
2	from your misrepresentation and lack of candor to the
3	Commission concerning the running of Contemporary Media in
4	your other broadcasting companies as you were convicted?
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I'm going to stop you right
6	there because there's no such thing as being rehabilitated
7	from making a false statement. You can't be rehabilitated.
8	It's done, it's done. Just don't do it again.
9	MR. OSHINSKY: I agree, Your Honor.
LO	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Other than that it's a proper
L1	question.
L2	MR. OSHINSKY: Now in your testimony, your direct
L3	written testimony, you admit that you were convicted of sexual
L4	offenses, correct?
L5	THE WITNESS: Yes.
L6	MR. OSHINSKY: Your Honor, I have one of the
L7	documents that Mr. Jacobs submitted to us in discovery. And
L8	I guess it would be best if we had it marked. Is there
L9	somebody here to mark it?
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'll mark it myself. What is your
21	next, what is your last exhibit. In the big book, what is
22	your last exhibit?
23	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Direct Case Exhibit 9, Your
24	Honor.
25	JUDGE SIPPEL: It's 9? So this will be 10.

1	(Whereupon, the above-referred to document was
2	marked as Direct Case Exhibit No. 10 for identification.)
3	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes, remember the
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Did the reporter understand that?
5	MR. OSHINSKY: I'm going to hand you this.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: No, no. Don't just hand it to him.
7	Give it to me, give it to me. I have a document before me
8	that's, how many pages is this? None of these pages are
9	numbered.
10	MR. OSHINSKY: No, this is the original that we
11	received.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: It's a it's called Second Amended
13	Information. State of St. Louis, et cetera, against Michael
14	Rice.
15	MR. OSHINSKY: Right, this is the charging
16	document.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: A charging document. Okay, that
18	charging document, and what is the date on it?
19	MR. OSHINSKY: This is, I think 1991.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Let's not think. Oh, here it is.
21	July 5, 1994.
22	MR. OSHINSKY: Four, sorry. I'm going to give a
23	copy to Mr. Jacobs but I'm afraid I'm going to trip over this
24	line.
25	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, we're going to call it Exhibit

1	10, as your Exhibit 10, the Bureau Exhibit 10. It's
2	identified and received into evidence.
3	(Whereupon, the above-referred to document was
4	received into evidence as Direct Case Exhibit No. 10.)
5	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes, I'm actually going to have
6	trouble getting it to Mr. Rice.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's okay. Reporter, write your
8	comments. Go ahead. Could you get that no, go ahead.
9	Give it to him.
LO	MR. OSHINSKY: Well, I have to step over
L1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, I'm sorry. You're going to hand
L2	it to me.
L3	MR. OSHINSKY: Well, that's what I started to do.
L4	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm sorry. You got all that down?
L5	PARTICIPANT: Yes, sir.
L6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, I just don't want anything
L7	(Simultaneous speaking.)
L8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, I will be glad to assist you,
L9	unless your objective doesn't object.
20	MR. OSHINSKY: Well, it's a document that he
21	supplied to us.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, he might not like me
23	participating that much in the trial. Go ahead, go ahead.
24	Are you familiar with this document, sir?
25	THE WITNESS: Yes.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Take your time, take your time and
2	re-familiarize yourself. Don't take too much time, but I
3	mean, don't be rushed into things. Did you give my attorney
4	advisor a copy?
5	MR. OSHINSKY: I did not, sir.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, you almost ready, Mr. Rice?
7	THE WITNESS: Yes.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: You said yes?
9	THE WITNESS: Yes.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Go ahead.
11	MR. OSHINSKY: Mr. Rice, isn't it true that you
12	were convicted of six counts of sexual assault for having
13	deviant sexual intercourse with children who were between the
14	age of 14 and 16?
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, you know, I'm going to object
16	to that because there's no reason to go into that kind of
17	detail. The document speaks for itself. You could say isn't
18	it true that you were convicted of child abuse or something
19	like that, generic. But I don't want to unnecessarily get
20	into any detailed identifying, particularly when the
21	document's in the record.
22	MR. OSHINSKY: I understand that, Your Honor. But
23	we feel it's important because under the holding in Titus.
24	The type of crime involved is significant to the question of
25	rehabilitation. And here where it is a particularly heinous

1	crime, we think that that has a bearing on what Your Honor has
2	to determine in terms of whether Mr. Rice is actually
3	rehabilitated.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, okay. I'm going to talk to
5	Mr. Jacobs. Can you stipulate to that?
6	MR. JACOBS: No.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: It's not a heinous crime, you're
8	thinking it's not a heinous crime. Is it heinous or heinous,
9	how do you pronounce that?
10	MR. JACOBS: The point is
11	MR. OSHINSKY: Heinous.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Heinous, heinous crime.
13	MR. JACOBS: the hearing designation order made
14	it clear that this hearing was not to re-litigate any findings
15	or conclusions in the state court proceedings or FCC
16	proceedings.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right, let me stop you there.
18	He is not re-litigating. He's not re-litigating. He's simply
19	describing more than I want to hear, what a document says.
20	And the document speaks for itself. That's all I'm talking
21	about.
22	MR. JACOBS: The document has some language in it
23	which lay people or even attorneys might misunderstand because
24	it uses the word sodomy.
25	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right, now what is your point

1	that you want that language repeated here? Is that the idea?
2	MR. JACOBS: I would just like to make it clear
3	that under Missouri law, sodomy includes the mere touching of
4	another person. It does not require any sort of intercourse.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: You mean touching in a particular
6	area, not just touching somebody on the arm.
7	MR. JACOBS: Right.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Good. I'll tell you what, this is
9	getting confusing. Do it your way. Do it your way.
10	MR. OSHINSKY: Okay, thank you, Your Honor. You
11	have a question pending, Mr. Rice. The question was isn't it
12	true that you were convicted of six counts of sexual assault
13	for having deviant sexual intercourse with children who were
14	between 14 and 16 years of age? Weren't you convicted of
15	that?
16	THE WITNESS: I don't think I was convicted of
17	intercourse.
18	MR. OSHINSKY: All right, I'll take that. But you
19	were convicted of a sexual offense, I think it's also referred
20	to as sexual battery in the first degree?
21	THE WITNESS: Battery?
22	MR. OSHINSKY: You don't know what you were
23	convicted of?
24	THE WITNESS: That's what it says here.
25	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, do you have any reason to

1	disagree with this document? You've read it, you have it
2	THE WITNESS: No, I believe it's factual.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Accurate?
4	THE WITNESS: Accurate.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: This is factual. We don't want
6	alternative facts. This is factually accurate?
7	THE WITNESS: Yes, because it was a court document.
8	It was
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, no, no, no. Is it factually
10	accurate based on your recollection and understanding?
11	THE WITNESS: Yes.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: And you've read it, you've gone
13	through it for at least five minutes here, so you've refreshed
14	yourself. So that's, it's safe to say that you're giving a
15	true and correct answer to my question.
16	THE WITNESS: Yes.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
18	MR. OSHINSKY: So the answer is yes, you were
19	convicted of it?
20	THE WITNESS: Yes.
21	BY MR. OSHINSKY:
22	Q And isn't it also true that you were convicted of
23	four counts of sodomy for having deviant sexual intercourse
24	with children who were between nine and fourteen years of age?
25	A No.

1	Q	Is it true that you were convicted of four counts
2	of sodomy f	for having deviant sexual intercourse with children
3	under the a	age of 14?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	And you were convicted of six counts of deviant
6	sexual assa	ault of a child in the first degree, correct?
7	A	Which count is that, sir?
8	Q	I think it's count
9	A	The answer to that would be yes.
10	Q	Okay. And isn't it also true that you were
11	convicted o	of two counts of deviant sexual assault of a child
12	in the seco	ond degree?
13	A	Yes.
14		JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm listening, I'm listening.
15		MR. OSHINSKY: Okay. All the victims involved in
16	the crimes	you were convicted of were boys, is that correct?
17		THE WITNESS: Were boys?
18		BY MR. OSHINSKY:
19	Q	Boys.
20	A	Yes.
21	Q	These are all felony offenses, correct?
22	A	Yes.
23	Q	Have these convictions led to the revocation of
24	your previo	ous Commission licenses that you held, correct?
25	A	Yes.

1	Q	It's your believe, isn't it, that you were not
2	guilty of t	these crimes?
3	A	No, I was guilty.
4	Q	You were guilty? But you did not plead guilty to
5	the crimes	of deviant sexual assault of a child, correct?
6	A	I don't know. It was a stipulation and I think
7	it's attach	ned here.
8		JUDGE SIPPEL: Let me see if I can help. There was
9	a trial, is	s that correct? It was a criminal trial?
LO		MR. OSHINSKY: Yes, Your Honor.
L1		JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I'm asking the witness. Can
L2	you remembe	er anything about the criminal trial?
L3		THE WITNESS: Yes.
L4		JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. And what was your lawyer's
L5	advice witl	n respect to pleading to a plea of guilty or not
L6	guilty?	
L7		THE WITNESS: I don't know that he gave one. It's
L8	been so lor	ng I really can't recall. I know that
L9		JUDGE SIPPEL: Really?
20		THE WITNESS: Yes, they
21		JUDGE SIPPEL: I mean, as one thing a lawyer's
22	going to do	o, he's going to advise you as to whether or not to
23	plea in, as	s the expression goes. Was he a criminal lawyer?
24		THE WITNESS: Yes. He advised that we were going
25	to stipulat	te certain things on, and there's a document, and

1	I was sentenced to all in that document.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Where's the document.
3	THE WITNESS: Jerry, do you have that?
4	That is the document, Your Honor.
5	MR. JACOBS: Your Honor, may I interject?
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: You're objecting?
7	MR. JACOBS: Interject. May I say something?
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I don't know if there's a such
9	a thing as an interjection. There's an I object.
10	MR. JACOBS: I just want to say something.
11	MR. OSHINSKY: Your Honor, if I could just
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Let him finish.
13	Okay, sir. No, go ahead. I'm saying let you
14	finish.
15	MR. OSHINSKY: Oh, I was going to say, the charging
16	document that Mr. Jacobs furnished us is the, has within it
17	the facts that Mr. Rice stipulated to.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: And that's all part of Exhibit 10,
19	correct?
20	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: I got you, thank you.
22	MR. OSHINSKY: Should I go on?
23	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, please.
24	MR. JACOBS: Can I clarify for the record what this
25	

1		JUDGE SIPPEL: No, no, no, you can't do that now.
2	You either	object or let him finish.
3		MR. OSHINSKY: So the answer to the question, you
4	did not ple	ead guilty to the crimes of deviant sexual assault
5	on a child,	correct? You went to trial.
6		THE WITNESS: Yes, we went to a bench trial.
7		BY MR. OSHINSKY:
8	Q	Right. On a stipulation of facts, correct?
9	A	Yes.
LO	Q	And so you made the State of Missouri go to trial
L1	rather than	n plead guilty?
L2	A	Yes.
L3	Q	And at that trial you were convicted of the crimes
L4	that we wer	re just talking about, is that correct?
L5	A	Yes.
L6	Q	In 1994, the Department of Corrections opposed your
L7	early relea	ase from prison because you did not plead guilty,
L8	did not adm	nit your guilt or show remorse, is that correct?
L9	A	I'm not aware of that.
20		MR. OSHINSKY: Your Honor, one of the Bureau's
21	exhibits ir	n Direct Case Exhibit 4 at Page 24.
22		MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: It's the notebook.
23		MR. OSHINSKY: Yes, Your Honor.
24		JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, from Mr. Rice. Let's see, what
	İ	

25 is it now?

1	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: That's for the witness, Your
2	Honor.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I know it is but what is the
4	Exhibit number?
5	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Number 23, I'm sorry.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Number 3?
7	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: It's Exhibit 4 at Page 23.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right.
9	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: And actually, that can save
LO	you stepping over this, Your Honor.
L1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes. Our insurance is not that
L2	good. All right. This is what he's talking about. You see
L3	that page? This is the one that has a signature on it, is that
L4	correct?
L5	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes, Your Honor.
L6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Go ahead.
L7	MR. OSHINSKY: Timothy Vaughn.
L8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Go ahead. The witness, by the way,
L9	has a full set of your exhibits and is looking at the one
20	you're concerned with right now.
21	THE WITNESS: Could you repeat your question, Mr.
22	Oshinsky?
23	MR. OSHINSKY: I said in 1994, the Department of
24	Corrections opposed your early release from prison because you
25	did not plead guilty, did not admit your guilt or show

1	remorse, is that correct?
2	THE WITNESS: This is a letter from Mr. Vaughn who
3	was the prosecuting attorney.
4	MR. OSHINSKY: All right, Mr. Rice, it's a yes or
5	no question. You've already told us that you were tried on
6	a stipulated set of facts, and you were convicted, right?
7	THE WITNESS: Correct.
8	MR. OSHINSKY: You didn't plead guilty.
9	THE WITNESS: Correct.
10	MR. OSHINSKY: Okay.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: So what is the follow up? The
12	follow up is
13	MR. OSHINSKY: Is that
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: whose statement is that, that
15	you're reading?
16	MR. OSHINSKY: That's the statement from the
17	prosecutor in the case, Your Honor.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. And what is it that you want
19	to get a yes answer from, what particular language that he
20	uses?
21	MR. OSHINSKY: That the prosecutor's office opposed
22	early release for Mr. Rice based on his failure to plead
23	guilty.
24	JUDGE SIPPEL: And that's what it says on that

document?

1	MR. OSHINSKY: Correct, Your Honor.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Now, that happened, didn't it?
3	THE WITNESS: This was written before I reported
4	to prison. If you look at the date on this
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: What is the date?
6	THE WITNESS: The date on here is September 27th,
7	1994.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: And when did you report to prison?
9	THE WITNESS: It was in the fall of 1994.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, are we, do we have a quibble
11	here? I mean
12	MR. OSHINSKY: Your Honor, the document does speak
13	for itself. It states the State is vehemently opposed to
14	early release of this defendant. Whenever that argument was
15	made by Mr. Rice's attorney, this was the State's position.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right, all right. So you will
17	admit anyway that that's what appears on that page before you?
18	THE WITNESS: Yes.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: And is it your recollection that
20	that was exactly the decision that the State took at that
21	time?
22	THE WITNESS: I'm not sure I was ever informed of
23	that or saw that at that time.
24	JUDGE SIPPEL: When?
25	THE WITNESS: When this was written.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: I hear you, I hear you. I'm just
2	perplexed. I would think something like that, I mean, it was
3	kept from you? I mean, that's a very important document when
4	you're in prison.
5	THE WITNESS: I wasn't in prison at that date.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, now this is really a quibble.
7	On or about, this is 1994 you entered prison, isn't that
8	right?
9	THE WITNESS: Yes, sometime.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Some time?
11	THE WITNESS: Yes.
12	MR. JACOBS: Your Honor, may I supply a date here?
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, can you please?
14	MR. JACOBS: He began, Mr. Rice began his prison
15	term on September 30, 1994.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Now what is the date on
17	that document?
18	MR. OSHINSKY: September 27, Your Honor. Your
19	Honor, if
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: No, listen. That is
21	MR. OSHINSKY: It just means that that argument was
22	made on Mr. Rice's behalf.
23	JUDGE SIPPEL: That is a quibble. Do you know what
24	a quibble is?
25	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: So answer the question as best you
2	can. I know it was not on the day that you entered into
3	prison, it was three days before or whatever. Am I counting
4	it right?
5	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Is that accurate, the statement that
7	you have before you, without giving any consideration to the
8	date, the exact date.
9	THE WITNESS: It appears to be accurate. I think
10	this had to do with not giving parole.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: He was right, I mean, the question
12	is very relevant.
13	THE WITNESS: Okay.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, and go ahead.
15	MR. OSHINSKY: Now, Mr. Rice, it's your testimony
16	that you did not commit all the crimes that are part of this
17	stipulation that you were convicted under, is that correct?
18	THE WITNESS: No, I was guilty except for one that
19	I did not. However, on the stipulation it was all or nothing.
20	MR. OSHINSKY: And what does that mean?
21	THE WITNESS: The only way that the stipulation
22	would be put in is all the charges put on the stipulation.
23	MR. OSHINSKY: So in other words, you're denying
24	that you were guilty of one of the charges that you stipulated
25	to, is that correct?

1	THE WITNESS: Correct.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: What is that, what crime is that,
3	what charge is that?
4	THE WITNESS: It was one of them on there. But we
5	didn't have a trial and we didn't have the evidence. And it
6	was just a stipulation. I don't know if you would call it a
7	plea agreement, a plea agreement or whatever it was.
8	MR. OSHINSKY: Your Honor, it is what it is. A
9	stipulation of facts is an agreed statement of facts that is
10	in effect an arrangement between the State and the Defendant,
11	and that they go to trial on. And that is the case here.
12	That's what the documents show.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes. It's a very significant
14	document. You seem to be treating it lightly. It's a very
15	significant document. And I would like to know in that
16	document what is the charge that you say you were not, you
17	didn't commit?
18	THE WITNESS: There was one count on there that,
19	on there. But at that point we just knew we were really
20	guilty and we wanted to go through the process and move on.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: But this is the stipulated facts
22	that were submitted in the bench trial, is that right?
23	THE WITNESS: Yes.
24	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, why weren't, why was not this
25	prevented in the guilty plea? I mean, yes, in a guilty plea.

1	THE WITNESS: Because I told the lawyers and they
2	said look, Mike, it's all or nothing.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes.
4	THE WITNESS: Yes, all or nothing.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: But why did you force the State to
6	go to trial on that? You're coming at this the same ends,
7	you're getting the same result whether you pled guilty or not.
8	You knew you committed these crimes, you weren't going to
9	defend yourself against them. You entered into a stipulation.
10	And then the judge had to make a decision. I'm sure it wasn't
11	a very hard decision to make.
12	But nonetheless, a guilty plea is usually taken
13	well, you see what happened. A guilty plea is in your favor
14	under these circumstances. For some reason or other, you and
15	your lawyer or both decided to plead guilty and now it's being
16	held against you on your first crack at parole. You're
17	nodding your head yes. What am I supposed to take from that?
18	Do you see my quandary?
19	THE WITNESS: I see, Your Honor, yes. I believe
20	that I had an interview with someone from probation and
21	parole, and that lady wrote a report.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Who was that lady?
23	THE WITNESS: I don't recall the name.
24	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, she wrote a report. And then?
25	THE WITNESS: I think it was called pre-sentence

1	investigation. Does that sound correct?
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Sounds good to me. I'm not a
3	criminal judge, but I watch television too.
4	THE WITNESS: And we went through the information.
5	I was very distraught that day. I had a call at 9 o'clock in
6	the morning, my mother had just passed away in the nursing
7	home. But I went there.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, did your lawyer ask for a
9	continuance or anything?
10	THE WITNESS: No.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: That would have been a possibility.
12	I don't know how the judge would have treated it. I'm just
13	curious
14	THE WITNESS: This was, I believe, before the bench
15	hearing and trial.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes.
17	THE WITNESS: It was some months before.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. But still, the day that you
19	appeared in court, your mother passed away in a nursing home.
20	THE WITNESS: No, that was the day that I was
21	interviewed by the lady from probation and parole.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, and you knew about the fact that
23	she had passed away before you had the interview?
24	THE WITNESS: Yes.
25	JUDGE SIPPEL: And you never asked could you

1	postpone this interview because my mother just died?
2	THE WITNESS: No, I think it was one of those
3	things that it was a requirement that I go and I was just
4	answering her questions.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. That's the answer, that's his
6	answer. Go ahead, Mr. Oshinsky.
7	MR. OSHINSKY: Mr. Rice, isn't it true that you
8	believe the stipulation you made in the Missouri State Court
9	to these crimes was not an admission of guilt?
LO	THE WITNESS: I would have to read it. I don't
L1	recall now.
L2	MR. OSHINSKY: Well you were telling us, and you
L3	told His Honor that you are not responsible for one of the
L4	crimes that you stipulated to and were convicted of. That's
L5	correct, right?
L6	THE WITNESS: Correct.
L7	MR. OSHINSKY: And so therefore you're not
L8	accepting guilt for that particular crime, is that correct?
L9	THE WITNESS: Well, I accepted guilt with the
20	stipulation as it's written.
21	MR. OSHINSKY: Which one of these crimes that you
22	stipulated to are you telling us now you did not commit?
23	JUDGE SIPPEL: Look at the list.
24	THE WITNESS: I can't see the names on here, so I
) 5	can't answer that

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: You can't see the names?
2	THE WITNESS: Yes.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Of who?
4	MR. OSHINSKY: They're redacted.
5	THE WITNESS: They're redacted.
6	MR. OSHINSKY: But their initials identify them,
7	Your Honor.
8	THE WITNESS: I don't see them on this document.
9	MR. JACOBS: There are no initials in Exhibit 10.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: As I take it, this is a document
11	that the Bureau obtained from the
12	MR. OSHINSKY: From Mr. Rice's counsel.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Pardon me?
14	MR. OSHINSKY: From Mr. Rice's counsel.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, from his counsel, from his
16	do you know anything about who, I'm asking Mr. Rice, now, do
17	you know who made those deletions or those black marks
18	covering up the document, covering up the document?
19	THE WITNESS: No.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: They weren't always that way.
21	MR. OSHINSKY: So Mr. Rice, looking at this
22	document, you can't tell which crimes you committed and which
23	ones you did not that day?
24	JUDGE SIPPEL: Is it possible that this being a
25	public document, that they wanted to protect the minors?

1	Could these be the names of minors?
2	MR. RICE: That's probably correct.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well why am I right and you can't
4	remember. You don't remember that, I mean, you don't really
5	know that.
6	THE WITNESS: There's 12 counts here with different
7	victims. And I can't identify the one that Mr. Oshinsky asked
8	about.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, but says blank would testify
LO	as to Count 2. That would be somebody's name. I'm trying to
L1	understand why you can't help this along, why can't you tell
L2	me that? Or tell Mr. Oshinsky that.
L3	MR. OSHINSKY: Mr. Rice, I'll direct your attention
L4	to Count number 12.
L5	THE WITNESS: Okay.
L6	MR. OSHINSKY: Is that the one you're talking about
L7	that you did not commit?
L8	THE WITNESS: I believe that is correct.
L9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, I see, I see. Well do you
20	MR. OSHINSKY: I'm sorry, go ahead, Your Honor.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Can you just from your recollection
22	and from reviewing this case with Counsel, can you just
23	describe what the crime was that you had not been, you were
24	not guilty of? Forget about this document.
25	THE WITNESS: Okay. I denied at that time, and I

25

1	will today, that the whole event did not exist.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well see, I don't know what you're
3	talking about when you say that whole event.
4	THE WITNESS: The Count 12.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, Count 12?
6	THE WITNESS: Yes.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: But that's the only one?
8	THE WITNESS: Correct.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Fair enough.
10	MR. JACOBS: Your Honor, can we take a brief break?
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, you have to okay. All right,
12	we'll take a five minute
13	MR. OSHINSKY: Your Honor, I would like to get an
14	answer to my last question before Mr. Rice
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, we'll do that.
16	MR. OSHINSKY: confers with his Counsel. Is it
17	true that the stipulation you made in the Missouri State Court
18	to these crimes, to you was not an admission of guilt?
19	MR. RICE: I don't think this is the document.
20	Where is the stipulation? There was a page on that, and I
21	can't remember
22	MR. OSHINSKY: This is the charging document, Mr.
23	Rice. You can answer my question yes or no.
24	THE WITNESS: I'm not sure. I'm not sure.
25	MR. OSHINSKY: You're answer is you're not sure

1	whether you	believe the stipulation you made is an admission
2	of guilt?	You can answer that yes or no.
3		THE WITNESS: Well, I believe it had the effect of
4	an admissio	on of guilt, yes.
5		MR. OSHINSKY: You think it is an admission of
6	guilt?	
7		THE WITNESS: Yes.
8		MR. OSHINSKY: The stipulation. Yet you're telling
9	use here t	hat you did not commit all of these offenses, is
10	that correc	ct?
11		THE WITNESS: Correct.
12		JUDGE SIPPEL: Well you did, it's all but one.
13		THE WITNESS: All but one.
14		JUDGE SIPPEL: We're going to take a break now.
15	Mr. Jacobs	has I'm going to grant the break, five minutes.
16	We have fiv	re minutes.
17		(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
18	record at 1	l1:30 a.m. and resumed at 10:40 a.m.)
19		JUDGE SIPPEL: You're still under oath, Mr. Rice.
20		THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor.
21		JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. And did you speak to anyone
22	during the	break?
23		THE WITNESS: No.
24		JUDGE SIPPEL: Let's go. Let's go.
25		MR OSHINSKY. Mr Rice it's true that you believe

1	that, I'm	sorry. It's true that you believe these sexual				
2	encounters	with the children, these actions were out of your				
3	control, correct?					
4		THE WITNESS: Yes.				
5		BY MR. OSHINSKY:				
6	Q	And at time, at various times you blamed your use				
7	of alcohol	as a reason why these kind of sexual encounters				
8	with children occurred?					
9	A	That was one of the factors.				
10	Q	In fact, you've told me at your deposition that you				
11	were typica	ally binge drinking				
12	A	Correct.				
13	Q	when these encounters with the children				
14	occurred?	You haven't stopped drinking, have you?				
15	A	I do not drink, there's no alcohol in the house.				
16	If I go to	a Mexican restaurant I'll have a margarita because				
17	they taste	so good. One.				
18	Q	So your testimony is that you occasionally do				
19	drink?					
20	A	Occasionally.				
21	Q	And you also told Dr. Duncan-Hively that you				
22	continue to	o drink occasionally?				
23	A	Yes.				
24		JUDGE SIPPEL: When was the last time you were in				
25	a stage of	intoxication, or even so-called buzzed?				

1		THE WITNESS: Oh, golly, probably 20 years ago.
2	Or earlier	•
3		JUDGE SIPPEL: All right.
4		MR. OSHINSKY: And Mr. Rice, you've been advised
5	that you a:	re somebody who's labeled an alcohol abuser?
6		THE WITNESS: I don't know that I've heard someone
7	say that.	
8		BY MR. OSHINSKY:
9	Q	Have you been to AA meetings?
LO	A	I did when I was in prison, yes.
L1	Q	But you have been diagnosed that way. Didn't Dr.
L2	Stillings (diagnose you as an alcohol abuser?
L3	A	I believe that is correct, yes.
L4	Q	Now before you were convicted of these sexual
L5	offenses,	you used to operate radio stations, correct?
L6	A	Yes.
L7	Q	And you would sometimes invite the kids from the
L8	neighborho	od to see your radio station?
L9	A	No.
20	Q	You never did?
21	A	No.
22	Q	Do you remember when I took your deposition back
23	in Septembe	er of last year?
24	A	Yes.
25		MR. OSHINSKY: So I'm looking at Mr. Rice's

1	deposition Page 101.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: And Counsel will have an opportunity
3	to get to it.
4	MR. OSHINSKY: If I can read from the deposition.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Let Mr. Jacobs get his place.
6	MR. JACOBS: I'm there.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Go ahead, you can read it.
8	MR. OSHINSKY: At Line 10 on Page 101: One of the
9	places you drove to was to one of the transmitter stations,
LO	right? A radio relay station, is that correct? No. No, you
L1	did not, question. Answer: No, (redacted) once in a while
L2	would go over to the station with me when I had to pick up
L3	something. And (redacted) is one of the children who accused
L4	you in these crimes, is that correct?
L5	THE WITNESS: Yes.
L6	MR. OSHINSKY: And so do you care to change your
L7	answer now that I've read to you from your deposition?
L8	THE WITNESS: Yes, I recall saying that.
L9	MR. OSHINSKY: And did you do that, did you drive
20	the children to your stations on occasion?
21	THE WITNESS: Yes. But it wasn't our station. It
22	was one that I was a contract
23	MR. OSHINSKY: I just read to you your answer from
24	the deposition, is that correct? You told me no
25	THE WITNESS: Can you read it again?

1	MR. OSHINSKY: (redacted) once in a while would
2	go over to the station with me when I had to pick something
3	up.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Jacobs, why don't you just take
5	your copy over here and show it to the witness so that we're
6	sure
7	MR. OSHINSKY: Your Honor, we have extra copies of
8	the deposition that were amended.
9	MR. JACOBS: I object to the way that Mr. Oshinsky
10	is characterizing this testimony.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, it is cross examination. What
12	page is it on?
13	MR. OSHINSKY: It's 101. Your Honor should have
14	a copy of it as well.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, you want to give me one?
16	MR. OSHINSKY: Sure, you can have that one. We can
17	give this one to Mr. Rice.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: He's already turned to the page.
19	Okay. I don't want, I want no further use of names of these
20	young people.
21	MR. OSHINSKY: Actually, Your Honor, in the
22	charging document, they are abbreviated to their initials.
23	And the only reason I read it is because that's the way the
24	answer was in the deposition. But from now on
25	JUDGE SIPPEL: No, I'm talking about in the public

1	record.
2	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Put the initials in or some such
4	thing as that. And you're now going to have to, what do they
5	call it?
6	MR. OSHINSKY: Redact.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Redact.
8	MR. OSHINSKY: He's actually referred to in the
9	charging document as C.Z. Okay, Your Honor, I'll remember
10	that.
11	THE WITNESS: Mr. Oshinsky, what page are you
12	referring to?
13	BY MR. OSHINSKY:
14	Q Page 101 of your deposition at Line 10 through 20.
15	So your answer to my question is that you did on occasion
16	invite kids to your radio stations and drove them there,
17	correct?
18	A I did not invite them. When I went there to do
19	some work, he wanted to go along. He lived next door. So he
20	went with me.
21	Q But he was one of the neighborhood children,
22	correct?
23	A Correct.
24	Q Now at various times you blamed the children you've

molested for the sexual activity that took place with them,

		211			
1	correct?				
2	A	I did not blame them.			
3	Q	Did you ever make the statement that they enjoyed			
4	having sex	with you?			
5	A	I don't recall.			
6	Q	But it's possible?			
7	A	It's possible.			
8	Q	And is that your view of it, that they enjoyed			
9	having sex	with you, some of them?			
10	A	That's not my view now.			
11	Q	Was it your view back then?			
12	A	I don't know.			
13	Q	Well, you in your direct testimony, you claimed			
14	that these were non-violent crimes that you were convicted of,				
15	is that correct?				
16	A	Correct.			
17	Q	So you were saying that your victims were willing			
18	victims, is	s that correct?			
19	A	Well, there was no force involved. And I don't			
20	recall much	n of the incidents there. It was so long ago.			
21	Q	So the answer is you don't remember?			
22	A	I do not remember.			
23		MR. OSHINSKY: Can you tell, I'm sorry, strike			
24	that. You	groomed your victims in preparation for			

25

JUDGE SIPPEL:

Well, just a minute, I'm not

1	finished with this page. This is 101, right?
2	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes, Your Honor.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: You're saying that he
4	MR. OSHINSKY: That was
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: I said, so the question is then is
6	he the individual you had sex with over at the relay station?
7	MR. OSHINSKY: I haven't gotten to that yet, Your
8	Honor.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, okay. Sorry. I'm sorry.
10	MR. OSHINSKY: I gave you one line too. And Mr.
11	Rice, your treatment providers in prison and your other
12	treatment providers have talked to you about grooming children
13	for sex, haven't they?
14	THE WITNESS: Yes. Also in most
15	MR. OSHINSKY: And in these instances that you were
16	convicted of, you groomed your victims in preparation for
17	sexual encounters, is that correct?
18	THE WITNESS: I don't recall it that way.
19	MR. JACOBS: Your Honor, how is this line of
20	questioning not re-litigating
21	MR. OSHINSKY: Your Honor, if Mr. Jacobs wants to
22	make an objection, he should make the objection.
23	MR. JACOBS: This is my objection.
24	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, what are you objecting to, the
25	relevance of it?

Τ	MR. JACOBS: I believe it violates the hearing
2	designation order statements against re-litigating facts and
3	conclusions in the State Court proceedings.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: I see nothing being re-litigating
5	here. All he's doing is looking at a document and asking the
6	witness is that true or isn't that true. That's all he's
7	doing. This is not litigation in the sense that I think that
8	the Commission meant.
9	They're not putting evidence on of each of these
10	counts, criminal counts which he had pled guilty. That's not
11	happening. And I don't want to waste the time going through
12	that kind of an objection. Go ahead, Mr. Oshinsky.
13	MR. OSHINSKY: So is your answer yes or no, Mr.
14	Rice, that you groomed the victims in preparation for having
15	sex with them, as you understand the word grooming to mean?
16	THE WITNESS: Yes.
17	MR. OSHINSKY: Your answer is yes, you did groom
18	them?
19	THE WITNESS: I have to qualify that a little bit,
20	Mr. Oshinsky.
21	MR. OSHINSKY: Well, it's a yes or no question, Mr.
22	Rice.
23	THE WITNESS: Okay.
24	JUDGE SIPPEL: Answer yes or no and then qualify
25	it if you would.

1	THE WITNESS: Okay. At the time I didn't believe						
2	I was, so that would be a no.						
3	MR. OSHINSKY: So no, you did not groom these						
4	children?						
5	THE WITNESS: No.						
6	MR. OSHINSKY: Were you						
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Did you know at the time, at that						
8	date what grooming was?						
9	THE WITNESS: No.						
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: So it might have been grooming, but						
11	you don't remember						
12	THE WITNESS: No, I don't remember.						
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: that term?						
14	THE WITNESS: I mean, I think allowing people in						
15	your house and being friends with them, if that's grooming,						
16	6 then the answer to that would be yes.						
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well let me take an example. Let's						
18	say with CZ that you invite him in your house, and then what						
19	would happen?						
20	THE WITNESS: Oh, basically he would come over to						
21	watch television or						
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: At your invitation?						
23	THE WITNESS: He lived next door. He would knock						
24	on the door and ask to come in.						
25	JUDGE SIPPEL: To watch television?						

25

1	1 THE WITNESS: Yes, to watch	TV	or	I	had	a		
2	2 collection of, back then, compact disks.							
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: And?							
4	4 THE WITNESS: That's about it.							
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: He didn't come ove	r loc	okin	g fo	or se	x?		
6	6 THE WITNESS: No, I don't believe	THE WITNESS: No, I don't believe he did.						
7	7 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, you would kn	low,	woul	.dn	't yo	u?		
8	8 If someone knocks on your door and said I	If someone knocks on your door and said I want to have sex,						
9	wouldn't you know that?							
10	.0 THE WITNESS: I would know that,	yes	5.					
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, what other ca	rcun	nstar	ıce	s cou	ld		
12	there be?							
13	THE WITNESS: What other circ	umst	ance	: f	or h	.im		
14	d coming over?							
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, that he was	comir	ng ov	<i>r</i> er	aski	ng		
16	6 for sex, I mean, he's not asking it outrigh	ıt.						
17	.7 THE WITNESS: I don't recall hi	m ev	er a	.ski	.ng f	or		
18	sex.							
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: And you didn't, i	t wa	s no	ot i	lmpli	ed		
20	in anything he says.							
21	THE WITNESS: Correct.							
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: So wasn't your MO	to p	oly t	hes	se ki	ds		
23	with liquor?							
24	THE WITNESS: No.							
25	JUDGE SIPPEL: You didn't? You	u ne	ever	ga	ve a	ny		

1	liquor to any of them?
2	THE WITNESS: No.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Never?
4	THE WITNESS: Never. They had liquor but they
5	brought their own.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: You know, you're really getting
7	quibbling here. They brought their own, but you were
8	encouraging it to be drunk in your place. Or drank, whatever.
9	You were encouraging it, were you?
10	THE WITNESS: I certainly permitted it, so I guess
11	that would be encouraging.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, yes, I mean, you know, you're
13	not helping me at all. This doesn't make any sense that
14	somebody's just going to come over and watch TV and jump into
15	bed with you. I don't think things work that way. But I might
16	be wrong. But I don't think so. Well, you're kind of just
17	sitting there staring at me.
18	THE WITNESS: No, I'm trying
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Do you have any response to this?
20	THE WITNESS: to assimilate what you're saying.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: You understand it?
22	THE WITNESS: Yes.
23	JUDGE SIPPEL: And?
24	THE WITNESS: Well, they didn't just hop in bed.
25	JUDGE SIPPEL: No. You know, I'm not looking for

1	quibbles.	I want to know what the heck happened. It doesn't
2	have to be	any particular individual.
3		THE WITNESS: Okay.
4		JUDGE SIPPEL: But what the heck happened?
5		THE WITNESS: Well, I was drinking beer at that
6	time too.	
7		JUDGE SIPPEL: A lot of beer?
8		THE WITNESS: What?
9		JUDGE SIPPEL: A lot of beer?
10		THE WITNESS: Yes. Maybe a 12 pack that night.
11		JUDGE SIPPEL: Before CZ showed up or after?
12		THE WITNESS: During.
13		JUDGE SIPPEL: During, okay.
14		THE WITNESS: During.
15		JUDGE SIPPEL: So, and I'm using CZ in the generic
16	sense.	
17		THE WITNESS: I understand.
18		JUDGE SIPPEL: And so what would generally happen?
19	How did you	happen to have sex with these children? What were
20	the circums	stances? Did you show them porno films?
21		THE WITNESS: No, I did not do that.
22		JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, then what did you do? Did you
23	read them p	poems?
24		THE WITNESS: No.
25		JUDGE SIPPEL: There's got to be something in

1	between them knocking on the door and being in bed with you.
2	So what happened then? You were drinking beer, that we have
3	established. And the kids brought their own liquor.
4	THE WITNESS: Yes.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: And you never gave them your liquor
6	or your beers?
7	THE WITNESS: No. If I had soda in the
8	refrigerator, they could drink that.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. But they would bring their
10	own liquor over?
11	THE WITNESS: Yes.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: And was that a condition that if you
13	want to come over, you bring your own liquor?
14	THE WITNESS: No.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well why would they bring their own
16	liquor? Maybe they would come over and think that you would
17	give them liquor, no?
18	THE WITNESS: Well, I did not give liquor, I
19	wouldn't allow smoking of anything illegal in the house.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, why not?
21	THE WITNESS: Well, I was very against drug usage.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: That was bad?
23	THE WITNESS: That was bad.
24	JUDGE SIPPEL: But having sex with children was not
25	bad at that time in your life?

1	THE WITNESS: It certainly, I didn't think at that
2	time that it was as serious as it was.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I don't understand that. You
4	mean it was kind of like getting a traffic ticket or
5	something, this is really not as bad as it was? It was a
6	THE WITNESS: At the time I didn't think it was bad
7	as it was.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: At the time. Well, you did think
9	it was bad, though?
10	THE WITNESS: I wasn't thinking very clearly there
11	at that time. And I'm not sure what I thought. It was a time
12	that I was mentally ill.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, this is all in hindsight.
14	THE WITNESS: Yes.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I want to know then. Then.
16	THE WITNESS: Then.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Let's assume it's a glass.
18	THE WITNESS: Okay.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Was the glass one quarter
20	full, half full, of badness? Something in your head that's
21	telling you this is bad, but not very bad. So how high up the
22	glass would that feeling of badness go?
23	THE WITNESS: On your example, probably half a
24	glass.
25	JUDGE SIPPEL: So you thought that it was 50/50,

Т	but you still had, you had convinced yourself that this was
2	not so bad that it couldn't be done, or shouldn't be done?
3	THE WITNESS: Correct.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: And well, and you say, or perhaps
5	you say it was vulgar results of a mental condition?
6	THE WITNESS: Yes.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: And people who have, don't have
8	mental conditions do not get involved with children, is that
9	what you're saying?
10	THE WITNESS: I'm just talking about my case. I
11	don't know about other people. I do know that
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, there may be something
13	THE WITNESS: I had an undiagnosed mental
14	condition then, and unfortunately something bad has to happen
15	with a lot of people before you get help.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, we're not talking about a lot
17	of people, we're just talking about you. And that's all we're
18	talking about.
19	THE WITNESS: Yes.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: I know that this is referred to as
21	something deviant in a person that does that. My understand
22	of some generic descriptives. But I'm not convinced that you
23	have to have a psychiatric condition before something moves
24	you to have sex with children.
25	I'm just not sure of that. Maybe I can get

educated before I leave here. But the fact, what I'm trying to determine, the fact that you had bipolar disorder, which you didn't know about at the time, is that right?

THE WITNESS: Correct.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Was that the determinate factor that got you to have sex with kids? That doesn't make any sense.

THE WITNESS: It didn't make any sense at the time because I didn't know I had that disorder.

Well that doesn't make any sense to 9 JUDGE SIPPEL: The fact that you, there's people with 10 me saying that now. bipolar disorders, quite a few of them, and more than we would 11 like to have. And you know, it's a hardship, no question 12 about that. But I've never seen anything that correlates that 13 14 psychiatric problem with having sex with children, or having sex with anybody for that matter. 15

THE WITNESS: I was told, it was not a doctor, but I was told that one of the things that happen with people that suffer from bipolar is they do very risky things, some of them illegal.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, that's a far cry from what I'm saying though. It might, you know, maybe perhaps you would like to, somebody might get caught for shoplifting when he was on the wrong end of the bipolar situation. But I'm talking about specifically about molesting children, sexually molesting children.

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

1	THE WITNESS: I believe that one of the things that
2	bipolar is doing very risky sexual acts.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Can you repeat that answer?
4	THE WITNESS: I have been told that one of the
5	symptoms of some of bipolar is attempting very risky sexual
6	acts, in my case illegal very serious.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Who told you that?
8	THE WITNESS: I think one of the therapists I had.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: You think?
10	THE WITNESS: Well, that's how I got the
11	information.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I know that. I know that,
13	that's how you got the well I don't know that. But is
14	there any literature on this? Maybe I'm going to get educated
15	here. Maybe this is not that tough a thing to handle. But
16	I do not understand why being bipolar puts you in a position
17	where you're inclined to have sex with children. And if you
18	didn't have bipolar, you wouldn't have that inclination
19	because I guess that's what you're really saying.
20	THE WITNESS: That's what I think I'm trying to
21	say, Your Honor.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, you're doing well. But I
23	don't know why, in my experience I've never seen anybody,
24	anything that showed it was such a determinate effect of
25	bipolar disorder that it would go so low as to be assaulting

1	children.	As I said, shoplifting, there's a lot of things
2	that might 1	be done. Let me ask you this, you said that there
3	was drinkin	g going on.
4		THE WITNESS: Yes.
5		JUDGE SIPPEL: And going back to the glass analogy,
6	how much dri	inking was there, in general, how much drinking was
7	going on?	A quarter, a half, three quarters?
8		THE WITNESS: Those that came over didn't drink all
9	the time.	But much of the time they did.
10		JUDGE SIPPEL: Let's say, let's start with you.
11		THE WITNESS: Okay.
12		JUDGE SIPPEL: Full glass, three quarters, half
13	glass?	
14		THE WITNESS: At least a half at that time.
15		JUDGE SIPPEL: At least a half.
16		THE WITNESS: Yes.
17		JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I'm going to assume that a
18	half would	not make you legally intoxicated. You were just,
19	what do the	y call it, a buzz? You kind of had a buzz?
20		THE WITNESS: Well, I was buzzed to the point that
21	I would pas	s out.
22		JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, that's pretty serious stuff.
23	So when you	passed out, you would not be a threat to anybody.
24		THE WITNESS: Correct.
25		JUDGE SIPPEL: And when you woke up, were any of

1	these kids still there?
2	THE WITNESS: Yes.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: And what would the kids be doing?
4	Watching TV?
5	THE WITNESS: Yes, watching TV. Some of them
6	played cards.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Just waiting for you to wake up?
8	THE WITNESS: What?
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Just waiting for you to wake up?
10	THE WITNESS: No, not necessarily. I just my house
11	at that time had become, it was actually an apartment that
12	became kind of a hangout for them.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well that's interesting.
14	THE WITNESS: Yes.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: And who encouraged the hang out
16	approach?
17	THE WITNESS: I permitted it.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Did you encourage it?
19	THE WITNESS: I suppose I did, yes.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: So the word gets around to kids that
21	you got a neat place to hang out, so they come over and hang
22	out?
23	THE WITNESS: That's a fair statement.
24	JUDGE SIPPEL: And there's no, they have their own
25	alcohol, you do not supply any alcohol?

1	THE WITNESS: Not to them, no.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: You're sure?
3	THE WITNESS: Positive.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: And drugs are not allowed, marijuana
5	is not allowed?
6	THE WITNESS: No.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Marijuana has never been smoked in
8	that house?
9	THE WITNESS: Not to my knowledge.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, you would know, wouldn't you.
11	If you came in you would smell it. Why would anybody want to
12	go to your house and smoke it without you being there? Did
13	the kids have access to your house when you were not there?
14	THE WITNESS: No.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: You didn't leave a key on a ledge
16	or something for them?
17	THE WITNESS: No.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Now these incidents, if I'm
19	understanding this right, and let me just ask a question.
20	These incidents of kids passing out on beds, on the bed and
21	then you pulling their drawers down while they were asleep or
22	while they were groggy, what would cause them to become
23	groggy? Was it all liquor?
24	THE WITNESS: I don't ever recall that instance
25	that someone was passed out there.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: They were always awake?
2	THE WITNESS: They were awake when I was awake.
3	Some of them spent all night there.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, that's a pretty slick answer.
5	They were awake when you were awake. But they might have been
6	passed out or asleep and you woke them up and then they were
7	awake when you were awake.
8	THE WITNESS: I don't recall that.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: But if it happened you would recall
10	it, is that right?
11	THE WITNESS: I should have, yes.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: And again, taking that hypothetical
13	that somehow or other, and you'll admit to that, somehow or
14	other you were able to get their pants off?
15	THE WITNESS: Yes.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: You pulled down their knickers as
17	they say. Okay. Somehow you did that. And at any point did
18	these kids object?
19	THE WITNESS: I don't recall that, no.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: I mean, you must have had a pretty
21	slick system. I don't understand that. I mean, there was
22	more than one kid. And you never had any problem, I mean, you
23	never had any opposition to what you were doing?
24	THE WITNESS: No.
25	JUDGE SIPPEL: It's hard to believe that. I'm

1	just, I'm not trying to argue with you, I'm just saying I hope
2	you understand objectively who you're talking to and how I'm
3	receiving what you're telling me.
4	Do you think, or did you form an opinion, or did
5	you have an understanding that these children were themselves
6	sexually deviant, they were not like other children? These
7	would happen to be a particular set of sexually deviant
8	children?
9	THE WITNESS: I wasn't aware of that.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Did it ever enter your mind? If
11	they were so compliant
12	THE WITNESS: I suppose it's a possibility, but it
13	was never discussed.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: I mean, I've never heard of a
15	situation, of course I don't have that many situations I hear
16	about, of children being compliant, even if it's not, even if
17	force is not used. That they're plied with alcohol,
18	something, I don't know, I don't understand that they would
19	be willingly participating in this stuff. And you had so
20	many, how many kids did you have that you did this with?
21	THE WITNESS: Four.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Four. How old were they?
23	THE WITNESS: They varied in age, but I think from
24	16 to probably 13.
25	JUDGE SIPPEL: And those are different ages. So

1	young kids growing, developing have different reactions at
2	different times of their life, at that life span. They all
3	reacted the same way? I mean, given personality differences.
4	THE WITNESS: All of them kept coming over many
5	times.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: What were you giving them that would
7	cause them to come over?
8	THE WITNESS: A place to hang out.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, it's the only place to hang
10	out in those days? I mean, this was not a blighted
11	neighborhood or anything like that. These are just kids,
12	regular kids, isn't that right?
13	THE WITNESS: Correct.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: And how would they come over? I
15	don't understand. Well, I just don't understand. And what
16	I can't understand also is that you have not formulated some
17	kind of an opinion yourself about how did this happen. You're
18	saying you're that straight now. I think you would want to
19	know if you wanted to talk to a psychiatrist and say what the
20	hell was happening there?
21	These kids came over and they let me pull their
22	knickers down and do these things. Weren't you curious?
23	Aren't you curious?
24	THE WITNESS: Absolutely, because that's part of
25	the rehabilitation.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I don't care about the
2	rehabilitation. I'm talking about just plain intellectual
3	curiosity. Now let's assume that this question that you're
4	completely cured from this situation. And you would be
5	asking, you would turn to the document and say document, what
6	the heck was going on here, why were these kids so easy to
7	get. You haven't done that, just out of curiosity.
8	THE WITNESS: That's a good question.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: I know it's a good question.
10	THE WITNESS: Make me think about that.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, you have an answer?
12	THE WITNESS: Not now, I don't have an answer other
13	than I think they enjoy talking, being there with their
14	friends.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Did they enjoy the sex too?
16	THE WITNESS: Looking back, no.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Why looking back, no? Why couldn't
18	you say no, they didn't?
19	THE WITNESS: If you'll notice there's multiple
20	counts. The victims kept coming back and
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: I asked you a question.
22	THE WITNESS: Okay.
23	JUDGE SIPPEL: You said that in retrospect they
24	didn't like what was happening. I'm saying at the time did
25	they indicate to you in any way or form that they didn't like

1	the situation?
2	THE WITNESS: No.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Were they smiling?
4	THE WITNESS: I'm not sure, I don't recall if they
5	were smiling or not.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: You're making this very difficult.
7	THE WITNESS: I'm trying not to, Your Honor.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: I mean, I know it was 20 some odd
9	years ago, am I right?
10	THE WITNESS: Close to 30.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, we all get old fast. But even
12	that, even 30 years, I would think that this is such a
13	traumatic condition, situation, that it would be a
14	recollection. Do you have dreams about it? Do you dream up
15	saying, in a cold sweat saying oh my God, what I did or
16	anything like that?
17	THE WITNESS: I had a lot of
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Nightmares?
19	THE WITNESS: nightmares? Probably not.
20	Nightmares. But I realize at a point in time this is wrong
21	and needed to stop.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, what made you realize this?
23	What event?
24	THE WITNESS: I started to feel guilty.
25	JUDGE SIPPEL: What event, at what point?

1	THE WITNESS: Well, it was before the arrest, and
2	I started to feel guilty. And I said, you know, this just
3	doesn't seem right to me.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: And after you started getting those
5	feelings of guilt, did you still continue to react with these
6	children in the way you had?
7	THE WITNESS: No.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: You stopped it?
9	THE WITNESS: Stopped it, yes.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Was there any time an announcement
11	made to the kids I'm, I've got religion. Nothing more, no
12	mas?
13	THE WITNESS: No.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: You didn't?
15	THE WITNESS: No.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: Did you apologize to them, say I've
17	got these guilt feelings now, I'm so sorry?
18	THE WITNESS: At that time I did not.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, why not? What was in your
20	psyche that you didn't do that? I mean, if you had hit them
21	with a hammer accidentally, I think you would be apologizing.
22	I'm sorry, I hit you with a hammer accidentally.
23	But here you're doing something even more, I don't
24	want to say nefarious, but more of an I'm trying to say
25	something as having a greater impact even than a hammer on

1	their psyche. And you're just shaking your head. Do you
2	agree with that, or you don't? You seem
3	THE WITNESS: I agree with what you're saying, but
4	I don't recall saying to them individually even discussing the
5	act or anything like that.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: No, I'm not talking about that. You
7	wouldn't have to discuss the act with them. You just say you
8	know, I've really been acting bad lately with you, and I'm
9	really, I'm sorry. They would understand what they mean.
10	THE WITNESS: I think at that time, Your Honor, I
11	didn't realize how bad I was.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: In what terms bad? In a number of
13	times you did it?
14	THE WITNESS: Well, the act itself, and here I was
15	considered a good person in the community. And most acts like
16	that are done in hush-hush secret.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, even if it's done in hush-hush
18	secret with children, that doesn't make it good.
19	THE WITNESS: No, absolutely not.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm trying to see what triggered the
21	change. And you know, you thought it was not so bad at one
22	point, but you always had this inkling that this isn't
23	something altogether good. You knew that it was something
24	that had to be done behind closed doors because society
25	demanded that.

1	THE WITNESS: That is a fair assessment, yes.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: But what caused you to get religion,
3	if I can put it that way? You woke up one morning and says
4	oh my, I had a eureka moment. My God, what have I been doing?
5	THE WITNESS: I just decided in my mind at that
6	point in time that this was just wrong, and
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well what, were you reading things,
8	were you doing something with a talking to people who
9	talked about this? I don't know, how would it come to you
10	that all of a sudden you got this feeling of guilt when you
11	hadn't had it before?
12	THE WITNESS: Well, I just had guilt. I don't know
13	exactly what thought process I had.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, you see
15	THE WITNESS: I still have guilt.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, do you have the same guilt as
17	you had then, or is this more intense guilt?
18	THE WITNESS: More intense now.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Did it have anything to do with the
20	fact that you went to prison?
21	THE WITNESS: No.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: For what you did?
23	THE WITNESS: No. It certainly was traumatic. And
24	it was a stern warning from society about my actions.
25	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, at what point in time do you

1	have to find out that society doesn't like this particular
2	act? You knew all along that murder was not condoned. You
3	knew that bank robbery was not condoned. You know that fraud
4	was not condoned. But the thought that doing this to children
5	was he, it was okay but not okay, if I'm reading you
6	THE WITNESS: It was faulty rationalization on my
7	part.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: And this all has to do with
9	rationalization?
10	THE WITNESS: No.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm trying to think, that is
12	THE WITNESS: That's where the guilt comes from.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: I know that. I know that. But
14	there are people who do this type of stuff, I'm told or I read
15	about, that it never enters into their mind to be guilty about
16	it. You're nodding your head.
17	THE WITNESS: No, I'm trying to think. I got to
18	the point where I thought it was wrong.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: And can you tell me exactly, or
20	close to exactly when that point was?
21	THE WITNESS: It would have been probably early
22	1990 or '91. I can't remember.
23	JUDGE SIPPEL: And what prompted you to get that
24	feeling in 1990 or '91, what event?
25	THE WITNESS: Well, I had no urges to do that and

1	I was tired of people coming over to the house and I wanted
2	to turn over a different chapter in my life.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: You mean you were losing your
4	libido?
5	THE WITNESS: No, just had no mental urge to
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, a mental urge has to be
7	transferred to another part of your body, and was that not
8	happening?
9	THE WITNESS: No it was not.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: So you decided, what, this is no fun
11	anymore so I'm calling it quits. You kids go home? I don't
12	want any more of this. I'm paraphrasing you, of course. But
13	this is what's going through your mind?
14	THE WITNESS: Right. And then the feelings of
15	guilt and also the feelings of it's wrong. And at that point,
16	it's illegal.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, it sounds like maybe they were
18	all the factors came into play at one time, the illegality,
19	the moral wrongness of it, your bad feelings about it. I'm
20	trying to think was it a chicken or egg thing here, which came
21	first? Or did they all come simultaneously?
22	THE WITNESS: I think that the process all came
23	about at the same time.
24	JUDGE SIPPEL: It was about the time that you were
25	questioned by the police?

1	THE WITNESS: No, I believe it was before that.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: How much before?
3	THE WITNESS: Maybe five or six months.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: So it was close in time?
5	THE WITNESS: Yes, yes, it was close in time.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Did you tell that to any of the
7	prosecutors or any of the police that you had gotten this
8	awakening?
9	THE WITNESS: No, we didn't really make statements
10	to them.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, well that's a bad question.
12	Did you ever and I think I asked this before. Did you ever
13	apologize to these youths when all of a sudden you got this
14	feeling about five months before you were
15	THE WITNESS: I did not do it at that time. When
16	the
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: What time did you do it? At
18	sentencing?
19	THE WITNESS: When we went to the the only court
20	proceeding that was really had was the sentencing hearing with
21	the stipulation
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: So at sentencing?
23	THE WITNESS: and I made a statement at that
24	time that I'm very sorry that this happened, and apologized.
25	JUDGE SIPPEL: It was on the record?

1	THE WITNESS: I presume it was.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Do you have any evidence on that,
3	Mr. Jacobs?
4	MR. JACOBS: No, Your Honor.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: We don't know he did it, then. We
6	really don't. We don't have a witness to it. I would think
7	it would be some kind of a sentencing there would be a
8	transcript of the sentencing procedure, proceeding.
9	MR. JACOBS: We never received any such
10	documentation. We have, which I will mention in my redirect,
11	a document which is the Judge's sentencing order. But nothing
12	more than that.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well you see, my quandary is he is
14	telling me that he apologized at the time of his sentencing,
15	and there's no evidence of it other than his statement.
16	MR. JACOBS: Well, I think it's entitled to
17	credibility as his statement
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well of course you are. I mean, I'm
19	not suggesting that you should support what I'm saying. I'm
20	just saying that I'm desperately looking for something to
21	corroborate what he said because what he said was very
22	important. I'm getting nothing out of this.
23	THE WITNESS: Your Honor, the Judge would not let
24	any victim statements be read or any witnesses at that. When

he gave the sentence, I think the lawyer said do you have

1	anything to say, Mike, and at that time I said I'm very sorry.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: There must have been somebody taking
3	a transcript down, no?
4	THE WITNESS: I'm not aware of that. There may
5	have been.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well there's too many subjunctives
7	here. Does anybody have the time?
8	MR. OSHINSKY: Your Honor, it's about 12:25.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I think this is a good time
10	to break for lunch. Does anybody disagree with that?
11	MR. OSHINSKY: No, that's fine.
12	MR. JACOBS: Your Honor, do you think it would be
13	a violation of any rule if we attempt to reset that clock to
14	the correct time? It seems to be running but almost exactly
15	an hour
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: Do you think this is something
17	devious that I did?
18	MR. JACOBS: No, I'm just wondering, you know, when
19	I first came to the Commission
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right, let's go off the record.
21	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
22	record at 12:25 p.m. and resumed at 12:27 p.m.)
23	JUDGE SIPPEL: You could talk to your lawyer about
24	anything but your testimony, what you're on the stand for, do
25	you understand that?

1	THE WITNESS: Okay.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Talk about birds or anything you
3	want to talk about. You can talk about the case but, I mean,
4	not your testimony.
5	MR. OSHINSKY: Your Honor, could you extend that
6	also to his expert witness?
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: How many experts do we have back
8	there?
9	MR. OSHINSKY: Two.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Just two?
11	DR. DUNCAN-HIVELY: Your Honor, I'm Dr. Duncan-
12	Hively. This is Dr. Wells Hively.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, you will not
14	DR. DUNCAN-HIVELY: We come from St. Louis to
15	attend your hearing.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well thank you. No, I appreciate
17	this very much. I know this is really kind of a hardship for
18	you. But you understand my directive? You're not to talk to
19	counsel, or certainly not to talk to the witness about his
20	testimony at this point?
21	DR. DUNCAN-HIVELY: I understand, Your Honor, and
22	I'll follow your instruction.
23	JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you very much. And you, sir?
24	DR. HIVELY: Of course.
25	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Let's go get lunch. Okay?

1	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
2	record at 12:28 p.m. and resumed at 1:39 p.m.)
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, we're back on the record. All
4	right, I am almost finished here. I want to go back again to
5	that You are under oath now, sir. You are under oath.
6	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
7	ADMIN. JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. I wanted you to
8	understand that. And I am going to assume you have not spoken
9	with anybody about your testimony?
10	THE WITNESS: No.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Now I want to go back to that
12	empty glass again. In terms of your concern about marijuana,
13	I'm not going to say narcotics in general, I'll just say
14	marijuana, would your glass be full, half full, three-quarters
15	full?
16	THE WITNESS: If it was full I don't understand.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, you've got an empty glass.
18	THE WITNESS: Okay.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Fill it up, tell me where you want
20	to stop. How are your feelings about marijuana?
21	THE WITNESS: I don't like it at all.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
23	THE WITNESS: I don't want it in the house. I
24	don't want to be around people that use it.
25	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, why not?

1	THE WITNESS: It's just me. I think it is harmful.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. So you are basically
3	You are at the top of the glass, you're filling that up.
4	THE WITNESS: Oh, okay.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: No, don't tell me it's okay, I am
6	asking you.
7	THE WITNESS: Yes.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Could it be three-quarters and get
9	away with it?
10	(No audible response.)
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Anybody ever Well, you said you
12	never let it in your house.
13	THE WITNESS: Right. Well, I guess with that
14	example it would be full, the glass.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, that's what it sounds like.
16	Okay. And yet alcohol more or less gets a free ride, at least
17	back in that days, back in those days?
18	THE WITNESS: Correct.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: You can bring as much in, you can
20	drink as much as you want?
21	THE WITNESS: Yes.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: You don't feel that way today?
23	THE WITNESS: No.
24	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. I'm just curious about this,
25	because you and I aren't that far apart in age. You, back in

	245
1	1960, '58, how old were you in '58?
2	THE WITNESS: '68?
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: '58, 5-8.
4	THE WITNESS: Oh, in '58?
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes.
6	THE WITNESS: It's I'm not good at math in my
7	head.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Let me see if I can help you.
9	THE WITNESS: I'm almost 76, so
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: No, you wouldn't be 76, you would
11	have been about 18, 18 or 19?
12	THE WITNESS: Yes.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
14	THE WITNESS: Well, I graduated in 1959 from high
15	school, that I do know.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, '59.
17	THE WITNESS: Yes.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, okay, that's fine. So '60,
19	'61, '62, because I know, I experienced the Draft myself,
20	that's a historical day since they don't draft anymore, but
21	did you get a Draft notice? Did you get How did you manage
22	to either go in or out of the military? Did you serve? Did
23	you serve in the military?
24	THE WITNESS: No.
25	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. How did that happen that you

1	didn't serve?
2	THE WITNESS: I was disqualified for a medical
3	reason.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: What was the medical reason?
5	THE WITNESS: I believe that it was high blood
6	pressure.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: You were pretty young to have high
8	blood pressure. You're lucky you survived this long. That's
9	quite a
10	THE WITNESS: Well, I've had one heart attack.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes.
12	THE WITNESS: And I was classified, I remember this
13	one why
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: What does that mean?
15	THE WITNESS: and that meant that they could
16	extend, put me in some sort of military service until age 30
17	or 35, but I wasn't on the bus to go to training.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes.
19	THE WITNESS: That's what I understand.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: So you still had to roll the dice
21	until you were 30 years old?
22	THE WITNESS: Yes.
23	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. And they never bothered you,
24	never called you?

THE WITNESS: No.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Had you ever got mixed up in that,
2	what was that, like an auction or whatever the heck that thing
3	was when they put the little balls in
4	THE WITNESS: I remember that, yes.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: What was that called?
6	MR. JACOBS: The lottery.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: The lottery.
8	THE WITNESS: No.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Your witness, Mr. Oshinsky.
10	MR. OSHINSKY: Thank you, Your Honor.
11	CROSS EXAMINATION
12	MR. OSHINSKY: Mr. Rice, my last question to you
13	was that you groomed your victims in preparation for sexual
14	encounters, correct, and your answer to me was yes, is that
15	correct?
16	THE WITNESS: From what I know now, yes.
17	MR. OSHINSKY: Okay. And looking at your
18	deposition on page 98, Line 11, and I will read from the
19	deposition when everybody is ready.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Let counsel know when you got the
21	spot.
22	MR. OSHINSKY: Are you ready, Your Honor?
23	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm ready.
24	MR. OSHINSKY: Okay.
25	JUDGE SIPPEL: What is the line?

1		MR. OSHINSKY: Line 11. Question: My question
2	again is w	were you ever told that any of the actions you
3	performed	with these children could be characterized as
4	grooming?	Answer: Yes. Okay, which ones? Answer: Well, all
5	of them. H	aving them come over to the home, you know, letting
6	them smoke	in here. Do you remember telling me that?
7		THE WITNESS: Yes.
8		BY MR. OSHINSKY:
9	Q	Now you gave the children alcohol, allowed them to
10	get drunk	to the point of where some of them passed out and
11	then you ha	ad sex with them, is that correct?
12	A	No.
13	Q	Are you aware there is evidence in the record that
14	shows that	is exactly what happened?
15	A	That I gave them alcohol?
16	Q	Yes.
17	A	I am not aware of that.
18	Q	And also there is evidence that you brought
19	marijuana t	to these children and got them high and then had sex
20	with them,	is that correct?
21	A	No.
22	Q	There is also evidence that shows you showed the
23	children po	ornographic movies and then had sex with them, is
24	that correc	ct?
25	А	No.

1	MR. JACOBS: Your Honor, reference is being made
2	to evidence in the record but I have no idea
3	MR. OSHINSKY: Well I'm about to I'll clear that
4	up for you, and before I do I will ask this last question.
5	You accused some of these children about lying about the
6	circumstances surrounding the sexual encounters, is that
7	correct?
8	THE WITNESS: Yes.
9	MR. OSHINSKY: Okay. So I would ask everybody to
10	look at EB Direct Exhibit 4, Pages 12 through 13.
11	THE WITNESS: Twelve What pages was that?
12	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes, it's entitled August Parole
13	Hearing Report.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, what page is that?
15	MR. OSHINSKY: It's EB Exhibit 4, Pages 12 through
16	13.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, I see what you are saying.
18	MR. OSHINSKY: Do you
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Wait just a second. Do you have
20	MR. OSHINSKY: Mr. Rice, you have access to that,
21	is that correct?
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: This big book right here.
23	THE WITNESS: Is it toward the back here?
24	JUDGE SIPPEL: No, no, this
25	

1	EB Exhibit 4, Direct Case Exhibits, and then Pages 12 to 13
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: From here, and then Pages 12 to 13
3	MR. OSHINSKY: I'll give you a minute to, everybod
4	a minute to read through that.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. We can go off the record.
6	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off th
7	record at 1:48 p.m. and resumed at 1:54 p.m.)
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: We're back on the record.
9	MR. OSHINSKY: Thank you, Your Honor. Would yo
10	agree with me, Mr. Rice, that based on the information i
11	those records your answers to all of my questions should hav
12	been yes, correct, my last three questions?
13	THE WITNESS: What were they?
14	BY MR. OSHINSKY:
15	Q That you gave children alcohol, got them drunk t
16	the point where some of them passed out and then you had se
17	with them, correct?
18	A I did not give them liquor.
19	Q Did they drink until they passed out and then yo
20	had sex with them?
21	A I don't recall any of them passed out.
22	Q You don't recall it or are you saying it didn'
23	happen?
24	A I don't recall it.
25	O But it could have happened? Is that your testimon

1	it could have happened, you just don't recall?
2	A I just don't recall.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's not what counsel's question
4	was. Why don't you repeat it?
5	MR. OSHINSKY: I said your answer is that it could
6	have happened but you don't recall?
7	THE WITNESS: Highly unlikely, but I don't recall,
8	so I can't
9	MR. OSHINSKY: You can't say categorically that it
10	didn't happen.
11	THE WITNESS: It's been so long ago that I can't
12	remember.
13	MR. OSHINSKY: But the information you just read
14	indicates that it did happen, doesn't it?
15	MR. JACOBS: I object.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: What's the basis for your objection?
17	MR. JACOBS: This whole line of questioning.
18	Counsel has pointed out that what he is referring to is a part
19	of the Bureau's Exhibit 4, which is a series of documents from
20	the Missouri Department of Corrections.
21	Those documents are supposedly being offered as
22	business records of the Department of Corrections and,
23	therefore, are exempt from the hearsay rule, and not being
24	sought admission for the truth of what they say, but it's
25	quite clear that Mr. Oshinsky is trying to use that document

1	to	prove	the	truth	of	what	it	says.
---	----	-------	-----	-------	----	------	----	-------

- 2 It is a parole hearing report by some person named
- 3 Matt Kimsey, K-I-M-S-E-Y, Matt Kimsey. It has never been
- 4 admitted into evidence at any proceeding.
- 5 JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. The objection is
- 6 overruled. It doesn't have to be, this is cross examination.
- 7 All he is doing is to put the document in front him, he's not
- 8 asking him to identify and offer it into evidence. He is
- 9 simply putting a document in front of him and asking him the
- 10 questions.
- 11 MR. OSHINSKY: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 12 JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, no, I don't know. I mean it's
- 13 easy.
- MR. JACOBS: But he asked us to assume that it was
- 15 an authentic statement.
- JUDGE SIPPEL: No, he didn't. I didn't hear it.
- 17 | I didn't hear it.
- 18 MR. JACOBS: He said there is evidence in this
- 19 proceeding.
- 20 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well --
- 21 MR. JACOBS: There is no evidence in this
- 22 proceeding.
- 23 MR. OSHINSKY: I said there is evidence in the
- 24 record.
- 25 MR. JACOBS: It's not in the record --

1	(Simultaneous speaking.)
2	MR. OSHINSKY: I'm not talking about legally
3	admitted evidence, I just said evidence. I could have used
4	"information," there is information in the record.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, it's
6	MR. JACOBS: It's not in the record.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: This is going nowhere. The
8	objection is overruled.
9	MR. OSHINSKY: Thank you, Your Honor. And the
10	answer to you brought marijuana to these children, got them
11	high, and then had sex with them, correct, that should have
12	been yes as well, is that correct?
13	THE WITNESS: That I gave them marijuana?
14	BY MR. OSHINSKY:
15	Q Yes.
16	A The answer to that is no.
17	Q And that you showed these children pornographic
18	movies and then had sex with them?
19	A No.
20	Q So if the children are reporting this then you are
21	saying that they are lying about the circumstances, is that
22	correct?
23	A Yes.
24	Q Do you have any knowledge about why they would be
25	lying, to do that? Actually, Your Honor, I withdraw that

1	question. I'll let his answer stand.
2	Now, Mr. Rice, you promised these children, or some
3	of the children, jobs in radio, that you would get them a job
4	as a DJ, is that correct?
5	A No.
6	MR. OSHINSKY: So, Your Honor, I would direct the
7	Court's attention to EB Direct Exhibit 4, actually at the same
8	pages that you just were at. No, that isn't it. I'm sorry,
9	Pages 18 to 21, excuse me.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Eighteen to what is that?
11	MR. OSHINSKY: Eighteen to 21. I am going to try
12	to Actually, the most direct notation that I see here is
13	on Page 21 about the middle of the page.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
15	MR. OSHINSKY: Again, this is the same report.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: This is Exhibit 4 for
17	identification, Mr. Jacobs, if that makes it easier.
18	MR. OSHINSKY: Correct.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's a Bureau Exhibit 4.
20	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes, Bureau Exhibit 4, about the
21	middle of the page on Page 21.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: On 21?
23	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes.
24	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Let us know when you get to

25 it.

1	MR. OSHINSKY: I can actually read it, it's short.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Go right ahead.
3	MR. OSHINSKY: At the beginning the children were
4	looking for friendship and emotional support. Rice promised
5	several that they could have futures in radio as disc jockeys,
6	told them that he could get them good jobs later when they got
7	older. Some of the young boys were just looking for fun.
8	Does that inform your recollection, Mr. Rice?
9	THE WITNESS: I didn't promise anyone jobs. They
10	were way too young and we had no radio stations in that area.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well this statement says when they
12	get older, later when they get older.
13	MR. OSHINSKY: But you did tell them that you were
14	in radio, isn't that correct?
15	THE WITNESS: Yes.
16	MR. OSHINSKY: And did they admire you because of
17	the fact that you were making a living in radio?
18	THE WITNESS: I would assume so, yes.
19	MR. JACOBS: Your Honor, again, I object to any use
20	being made of this report from Detective Joel Fann, which is
21	hearsay and has not been admitted into evidence.
22	So asking our client to say whether some statements
23	in a hearsay document are true or false to me
24	(Simultaneous speaking.)
25	MR OSHINSKY: Counsel what if I showed him a

1	photograph, would you object to that not being in evidence if
2	I hadn't moved it in? The Bureau has not moved these in yet,
3	but I am asking him to read it, that's all.
4	MR. JACOBS: My point is that Detective Fann's
5	statement as far as I am concerned is worthless.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, okay, now why don't we clear
7	this up. Why don't you offer Exhibit 4 into evidence.
8	MR. OSHINSKY: You want to do that now, Your Honor?
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Sure, go ahead.
10	MR. OSHINSKY: Okay.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Lay the foundation and make your
12	motion.
13	MR. OSHINSKY: All right. Your Honor, I return the
14	Court's attention to Exhibit 5, EB Exhibit 5, and it's
15	entitled Declaration Regarding Business Records of the
16	Missouri Department of Corrections.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: I see it. You got it, Mr. Jacobs?
18	You got that?
19	MR. JACOBS: What about it?
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: The page he is talking about?
21	MR. JACOBS: I am aware of it.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
23	MR. OSHINSKY: So, Your Honor, the Bureau would
24	move the admission of these records as part of exception to
25	the hearsay rule Federal Rules of Evidence 8038 husiness

1	records of the Missouri Department of Corrections.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Which are kept in the regular course
3	of business?
4	MR. OSHINSKY: Right, yes. This is a declaration
5	that's kept in the ordinary course of business.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Is there any objection to that?
7	MR. JACOBS: I have a general objection.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, give me a specific objection.
9	MR. JACOBS: If they are only being admitted as
LO	business records I have no specific objection except that one
L1	of them is essentially illegible, and I'll tell you in a
L2	second.
L3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, the motion is granted, it's
L4	in evidence.
L5	(Whereupon, the above-referred to document was
L6	received into evidence as EB Exhibit No. 4.)
L7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Now let's clear up that page.
L8	MR. JACOBS: It's not a page, it's a whole report.
L9	The MOSOP Participation and Examination Report at Pages 7
20	through 10 is essentially illegible.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Is that part of Exhibit 4?
22	MR. JACOBS: Yes.
23	JUDGE SIPPEL: I think I remember I know what
24	you are talking about. I think I had the same
25	MR. JACOBS: Seven through 10.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Let's hear it from you, Mr.
2	Oshinsky.
3	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Your Honor, a couple of
4	points. One is that we are offering them as an exception to
5	the hearsay rule in the coming, for the truth of the matter
6	asserted, so we want to be very clear on that. We are not
7	just offering them for any limited purpose.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: I understand that.
9	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Okay. Second
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: But I don't My ruling doesn't
11	necessarily come to that conclusion, you know.
12	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: You understand You give
13	them the weight, I appreciate that you are going to give them
14	the weight, but we are offering them under the exception to
15	the hearsay rule where we are offering them for the truth of
16	the matter asserted, whether you both find them sufficiently
17	reliable I understand.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, all right.
19	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: The second part is with
20	respect to the illegible document
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes?
22	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Your Honor will recall we
23	issued a subpoena to the Missouri Department of Corrections
24	and the response to the subpoena is this is the they pulled
25	the file from archives and this is the best copy available.

1	So we are not offering and we have witnesses
2	that are familiar with these MOSOP reports coming for the next
3	two days and if you have trouble reading it to this they have
4	insights into what is being said because they are familiar
5	with documents of this type.
6	MR. OSHINSKY: I'd also note, Your Honor, that they
7	are offering a certificate from this program into evidence,
8	that's part of the Lake direct case exhibits, so it's an
9	important document. This document that Mr. Jacobs is
10	mentioning is only partially illegible.
11	One of our expert witnesses is able to discern
12	certain information and, actually, if you look at it you can
13	see a number of items in there that are quite significant
14	since Lake is relying on the MOSOP program so heavily.
15	MR. JACOBS: I'm sorry, Your Honor, if the Bureau
16	had any sense of propriety here they would know that the only
17	way they can present something like this is for them to have
18	one of their experts literally
19	MR. OSHINSKY: That is exactly what's going to
20	happen.
21	MR. JACOBS: type out the entire pages so that
22	we know what these documents say.
23	MR. OSHINSKY: This is the best evidence, Your
24	Honor, that is available at this time.

JUDGE SIPPEL: You are going to clear up the record

1	in other words before you finish?
2	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes. Dr. Weitl should be able to
3	clarify.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right, okay. Well, I am not
5	particularly happy with that because that should have been
6	cleared up before you assembled your case in chief, but let's
7	I'm going to just let it rest and we'll see what happens.
8	We'll see what happens. We got a witness coming in. Okay?
9	Your objection is still pending.
10	MR. JACOBS: It's
11	MR. OSHINSKY: Your Honor, I would note that Mr.
12	Jacobs did not object to this record on the basis of
13	illegibility.
14	MR. JACOBS: That's not true.
15	MR. OSHINSKY: There are notations in the report
16	(Simultaneous speaking.)
17	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: I've got your objections to
18	exhibits.
19	MR. OSHINSKY: which are highly probative.
20	MR. JACOBS: The Bureau has had this exhibit in its
21	possession since July 15, 2015, and at that time they sent it
22	to us and
23	JUDGE SIPPEL: They who? Being who, they?
24	MR. JACOBS: The Bureau.
25	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.

1	MR. JACOBS: As part of Discovery, and I pointed
2	out the problem. They said they would look into it as they
3	indicated they have, but they were not able to produce a
4	better version. And now they say, 2-1/2 years later, sorry,
5	two years later, they are going to perhaps produce someone who
6	can decipher the pages.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Right.
8	MR. JACOBS: Yet this is potentially an important
9	document and they have just been sitting on it.
10	MR. OSHINSKY: Your Honor, I object to that
11	characterization. It's completely untrue. The document
12	Your Honor can give the document the weight that you feel it
13	deserves.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I'm going to wait until, or
15	wait, I am going to W-A-I-T until all your testimony on this
16	is finished and then I will make a decision.
17	But, Mr. Jacobs, I am very I am curious about
18	this. You have had that document since 2015.
19	MR. JACOBS: Right.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Did you make any efforts to get a
21	clean copy from the Department of Corrections?
22	MR. JACOBS: No, because the Bureau said that it
23	was doing it.
24	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well wouldn't it be interesting to
25	know what was going on, just in trial preparation?

1	MR. JACOBS: I don't want to get into how many
2	times I have asked the Bureau for updates on things and have
3	gotten nothing.
4	Onto the question of whether I objected to the
5	illegibility, if you look at our objections to Direct Case
6	Exhibits dated April 21, 2017, in the last paragraph it says:
7	Moreover, a number of the pages are partially illegible and,
8	therefore, are unacceptable on that basis alone.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
10	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: And you are correct. I stand
11	corrected on that date, Your Honor.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, April 21. All right.
13	MR. OSHINSKY: But, Your Honor, again, it goes to
14	the weight of the document.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: I don't want to get instruction.
16	I simply want I'm trying to just make the rulings. The
17	rulings is that the document is received in evidence, Exhibit
18	4, with the exception of those pages that you are talking
19	about that are
20	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes, they're
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: not decipherable right now
22	MR. OSHINSKY: Right.
23	JUDGE SIPPEL: until you have your witness on.
24	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes, they're not really at issue at
25	this point.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's exactly right. We wait until
2	there is testimony about it.
3	MR. OSHINSKY: Right.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: And, you know, you might not win
5	this motion, so I want you to know I am going into this with
6	an open mind. Okay, so it was April I'm sorry, what was
7	the date of your motion?
8	MR. JACOBS: April 21.
9	MR. OSHINSKY: Thank you, Your Honor.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
11	MR. OSHINSKY: Okay, now we have to
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, we're finished with that.
13	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: For now.
15	MR. OSHINSKY: Okay. So I had actually just read
16	a section of one of the records into the testimony and I asked
17	Mr. Rice if he would like to change his testimony after
18	reading that and your answer was?
19	THE WITNESS: Reading what?
20	MR. OSHINSKY: Reading the section about having
21	offered these children, or at least some of them, jobs in
22	radio as DJ or in the future.
23	THE WITNESS: I didn't offer them jobs.
24	MR. OSHINSKY: At the time of the
25	JUDGE SIPPEL: Wait a second, Mr. Oshinsky.

1	MR. OSHINSKY: Sure, I'm sorry.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: You know, maybe you didn't offer
3	them jobs, but did you kind of hold it out there as a hope or
4	a dream? Say, well, you know, maybe someday
5	THE WITNESS: I don't think that anybody that came
6	over to the house was interested in being in or on radio in
7	any capacity.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: They were or were not?
9	THE WITNESS: Were not.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Are you sure? Did you ask them
11	that?
12	THE WITNESS: No, but we never really talked about
13	careers in radio, nor was I asked.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, if I had teenagers coming as
15	company into my house I would ask them, I would say, you know,
16	did you ever think about being a lawyer. You wouldn't do that
17	though?
18	THE WITNESS: No.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: I don't mean a lawyer, I mean
20	THE WITNESS: Right, I understand.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Okay, I'm sorry, go ahead,
22	Mr. Oshinsky.
23	MR. OSHINSKY: Now at the time of the crimes you
24	owned radio stations which had transmitter buildings, correct?
25	THE WITNESS: All of them did, yes.

1	BY MR. OSHINSKY:
2	Q And you told me actually that you had built those
3	radio stations and those transmitter stations from scratch,
4	is that correct?
5	A Most of them.
6	Q A transmitter building is where the radio tower is
7	housed, is that correct?
8	A Correct.
9	Q One of the victims in this case was the child of
10	your neighbor, is that correct?
11	A Yes.
12	Q And that's the individual we are referring to know
13	as C.Z.?
14	A Yes.
15	Q This child was 11 years old at the time you started
16	molesting him, correct?
17	A No.
18	Q Are you aware that this victim has claimed that he
19	was 11 years old at the time he began his relationship with
20	you, his sexual relationship?
21	A No.
22	MR. OSHINSKY: Your Honor, just a moments
23	indulgence. Your Honor, there is a notation in the record
24	here that this victim was 11 years old. Unfortunately, I
25	haven't marked it very well, so I am going to ask Mr. Knowles-

1	Kellett to continue looking for it.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm sorry, I didn't hear?
3	MR. OSHINSKY: I'll ask Mr. Knowles-Kellett to look
4	for that reference and I will move on.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Go right ahead, it's all right.
6	What's the date of this Exhibit 4? Is that March 19, 1999?
7	No, that's the MOSOP participation
8	MR. JACOBS: There are various dates because there
9	are a whole slew of reports in there.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right, I got you. I see the
11	MOSOP and Well, there is some Never mind. This one is
12	August 9, 1996, is that right?
13	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes, Your Honor, I think.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: August Parole Hearing Report?
15	MR. OSHINSKY: Correct.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Did you At the time the
17	report was published did you get a copy of it?
18	THE WITNESS: Which?
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: The one in August, the one we were
20	talking about. Look at your book at Exhibit 4, that was done
21	in August 9, 1996. Well, that's the date it was typed. It
22	was dictated in July of that year.
23	MR. OSHINSKY: Your Honor, actually we found it.
24	It's about midway down on Page 12.

JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Well let me ask the

1	witness my questions first. Did you see a copy of that report
2	in 1996?
3	THE WITNESS: I don't recall.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: You don't recall something like
5	this?
6	THE WITNESS: This is before the trial.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: I believe that's true.
8	THE WITNESS: Is that true, okay.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: I believe it is, I don't know. You
10	know the dates better than I do, or you should. Are you
11	looking for something? Are you trying to formulate an answer
12	or
13	THE WITNESS: No, I'm trying to look for the
14	context.
15	MR. JACOBS: Your Honor, again, to clarify
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: No, no, don't interrupt me. The
17	contents is what you have been testifying to for the last half
18	hour. It's I got a Page 11 and it says Missouri Department
19	of Corrections.
20	THE WITNESS: I am on the wrong page here.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, as the saying goes we all have
22	to be on the same page.
23	THE WITNESS: Okay, Page 11, Exhibit 4.
24	JUDGE SIPPEL: Right.
25	THE WITNESS: Okay.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: See, it's the
2	MR. OSHINSKY: It's Page 12, actually.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: No, mine says 11. I might not have
4	
5	MR. OSHINSKY: Oh, okay, I'm sorry, excuse me.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: And it says the date it was dictated
7	is July '96 and that it was typed in August '96. Okay? You
8	are nodding yes.
9	THE WITNESS: Yes.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: And my question to you is, at any
11	time in 1996 were you given a copy of this report or were you
12	to read or
13	THE WITNESS: I don't believe so. Perhaps an
14	attorney was given a copy.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, that's a horrible answer.
16	THE WITNESS: Yes, it is.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: This is like This is almost like
18	Melville didn't proofread Moby Dick or something. I mean this
19	is a big deal, it's your life.
20	THE WITNESS: Yes, it's a big deal and I take it
21	very seriously, Your Honor.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, but you can't answer my
23	question. I am not even asking for a specific day. I want
24	to know at what point in time on the calendar did you have
25	this in your possession where you could read it, not

1	necessarily the date certain. At least keep it in years.
2	THE WITNESS: I don't recall having this in my
3	possession, but it's been so long ago I really can't remember.
4	I didn't save documents like this.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, it's not a keepsake, you know.
6	MR. JACOBS: Your Honor, again, I need to remind
7	everyone that Mr. Rice went to prison on September 30, 1994.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Right.
9	MR. JACOBS: Two years before this document was
10	created.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Correct.
12	MR. JACOBS: Now I have never been in prison so I
13	don't know what the day-to-day routine is, but I would not be
14	surprised if the Board of Parole would not give me copies of
15	documents if I was
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: Wait a minute, of a parole report
17	regarding your I mean this is a parole report, is that
18	right? Is that what it is?
19	MR. OSHINSKY: It says Parole Hearing Report.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Now, and you say that
21	the incarcerated witness or person is not going to ever be
22	able to see this report?
23	MR. JACOBS: Maybe not.
24	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, yes, but everybody is calling
25	maybe and I can't remember this is What is the first time

1	you remember seeing this report?
2	THE WITNESS: I don't even recall that.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, you're seeing it now.
4	THE WITNESS: Yes, I am seeing it now.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Did you ever see it before?
6	THE WITNESS: I don't think so. This was done when
7	I was at the correctional place.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: I see that. So it's possible that
9	you don't have a recollection of those things that were
10	written down but those things that were written down in this
11	exhibit may have been accurate if you have never read it
12	until now and you are having a difficult time recalling those
13	events because it was a long time ago?
13 14	events because it was a long time ago? (No audible response.)
14	(No audible response.)
14 15	(No audible response.) JUDGE SIPPEL: Could you answer my question?
14 15 16 17	(No audible response.) JUDGE SIPPEL: Could you answer my question? THE WITNESS: Your question is when did I see this?
14 15 16 17	(No audible response.) JUDGE SIPPEL: Could you answer my question? THE WITNESS: Your question is when did I see this? JUDGE SIPPEL: I am asking you perhaps the
14 15 16 17 18	(No audible response.) JUDGE SIPPEL: Could you answer my question? THE WITNESS: Your question is when did I see this? JUDGE SIPPEL: I am asking you perhaps the information in Exhibit 4 that you disagree with might be
14 15 16 17 18 19	(No audible response.) JUDGE SIPPEL: Could you answer my question? THE WITNESS: Your question is when did I see this? JUDGE SIPPEL: I am asking you perhaps the information in Exhibit 4 that you disagree with might be accurate because it was 20-some odd years ago, probably even
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	(No audible response.) JUDGE SIPPEL: Could you answer my question? THE WITNESS: Your question is when did I see this? JUDGE SIPPEL: I am asking you perhaps the information in Exhibit 4 that you disagree with might be accurate because it was 20-some odd years ago, probably even longer than that, 30 years almost, and you don't recall
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	(No audible response.) JUDGE SIPPEL: Could you answer my question? THE WITNESS: Your question is when did I see this? JUDGE SIPPEL: I am asking you perhaps the information in Exhibit 4 that you disagree with might be accurate because it was 20-some odd years ago, probably even longer than that, 30 years almost, and you don't recall reading this at any time before this case came, till now,
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	(No audible response.) JUDGE SIPPEL: Could you answer my question? THE WITNESS: Your question is when did I see this? JUDGE SIPPEL: I am asking you perhaps the information in Exhibit 4 that you disagree with might be accurate because it was 20-some odd years ago, probably even longer than that, 30 years almost, and you don't recall reading this at any time before this case came, till now, today, I guess it's the only thing I can pin you down on, and

1	THE WITNESS: No, but I could read it and
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: I know you can read it.
3	THE WITNESS: Yes.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: But how do you If you don't
5	If it's written back in '96 and you didn't read it in '96,
6	'97, '98, when you would have been fresh in your mind, how do
7	you know sitting down here today that Exhibit 4 is not
8	accurate?
9	It's not accurate, but it could be accurate. Based
10	on your prior testimony you don't remember anything back that
11	far. It's specific, you can't remember anything specific.
12	THE WITNESS: I guess I I can remember some
13	things about in prison and the parole hearings and things like
14	that.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: I am not asking you about those.
16	THE WITNESS: But that's when this was written,
17	during that period of time.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, that's what I am asking you
19	about this document.
20	THE WITNESS: Yes.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: And I am asking you did you have a
22	chance to read this ever about that time. I'm not even sure
23	what your answer is. '94, '95, '96?
24	THE WITNESS: I just don't recall so I don't want
25	to give an answer that

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's all right, you don't recall.
2	THE WITNESS: Yes.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Did you What about your lawyer,
4	were you being represented by a lawyer during this?
5	THE WITNESS: Yes.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: So, let's I'm going to Well,
7	I'm not going to assume anything. Okay. That finished
8	That's it for me.
9	MR. OSHINSKY: Your Honor, so the statement, the
10	information I am pointing to in the record reads: According
11	to the Victim Impact Statement dated 08/15/94 one victim
12	stated that while he is now 19 years old he was only 11 at the
13	time Rice sexually molested him.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: Now what page is that?
15	MR. OSHINSKY: That is Page 12 about midway down
16	the page.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Of Exhibit 4?
18	MR. OSHINSKY: Of Exhibit 4, Your Honor.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: I see. I see exactly where you are.
20	MR. OSHINSKY: Now, Mr. Rice, do you see that on
21	Page 12?
22	THE WITNESS: Is that about halfway down?
23	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes.
24	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, sir.
25	THE WITNESS: Okay. I see that now.

1		MR. OSHINSKY: Okay. And does that refresh your
2	recollecti	on that this child was only 11 years old?
3		THE WITNESS: No, I don't think there was anyone
4	ever in th	e house 11 years old. They were all adolescents.
5		BY MR. OSHINSKY:
6	Q	But you told me at your deposition you really
7	didn't kno	w how old the children were, did you?
8	A	No, just by physical appearance you can guess.
9	Q	So he could have been 11 years old, isn't that
10	true?	
11	A	Probably not.
12	Q	But he could have been?
13	A	No.
14	Q	Why not?
15	A	Because I just never wanted people that age in the
16	house.	
17	Q	But you didn't know how old he was, perhaps he
18	looked old	er. Did he look older than 11?
19	A	I am not sure I know which person this is.
20	Q	Well, this is C.Z.
21	A	Oh, okay, that was the neighbor.
22	Q	Yes.
23	A	Okay.
24	Q	Your neighbor's son.
25	Δ	Vec

1	Q	And you told me at your deposition that you had a
2	long sexual	l relationship with him, lasting years.
3	A	Correct.
4	Q	So he could well have been 11 years old when you
5	began, isn'	t that true?
6	A	I don't believe so.
7	Q	But it could have been?
8	A	No. You're putting words in my mouth.
9	Q	I am asking you is it possible. Did you see his
LO	birth certi	ificate?
L1	A	No, I didn't the give birth certificates
L2	Q	And he was too young to have a driver's license,
L3	correct?	
L4	A	Yes.
L5	Q	Okay. So the truth is you never saw any evidence
L6	of his age	one way or the other except his appearance, isn't
L7	that true?	
L8	A	Yes.
L9	Q	Okay. So he could have been 11 years old, isn't
20	that true?	
21	A	I don't think I knew him when he was 11, but that's
22		
23	Q	So your answer is, yes, it could have been, right?
24		(No audible response.)
25		MR. OSHINSKY: Okav, so let me point out to you the

1	answer you gave me in your deposition at Page 61, Line 8.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Page what?
3	MR. OSHINSKY: That's at the beginning of Line 5
4	on Page 61.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
6	MR. OSHINSKY: And I can read it whenever you are
7	ready. Are you ready? Are you at page 61 of the exhibit?
8	THE WITNESS: Yes. Yes, I've read it.
9	BY MR. OSHINSKY:
10	Q The question was: But, Mr. Rice, do you know for
11	a fact that the victim was not age 11 in October 1988, isn't
12	that something that's easily provable? Answer: I didn't know
13	his age, but I didn't think he was 11 when he came over
14	because we never had anyone that young over. That was your
15	answer, right?
16	A Yes. And it's still my answer today.
17	Q But that also goes with the answer he could have
18	been 11 years old, isn't that true? It's possible that he was
19	11?
20	A Well, it's possible. He could have nine, I'm not
21	sure.
22	Q Okay, you're answer is it's possible then?
23	A Yes.
24	MR. OSHINSKY: Okay. Thank you.
25	JUDGE SIPPEL: Did vou ever ask him what grade he

1	was in in school?
2	THE WITNESS: He was in junior high school when he
3	started coming over.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, that would make him more than
5	11.
6	THE WITNESS: Yes.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: So Okay, I'll take that answer,
8	but you did testify, I asked you a question straight on and
9	you said that the ages of these young people was from 16 years
10	old down to 13, you told me that.
11	THE WITNESS: Yes.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: And that's only a two year
13	difference between 13 and 11, so why, how can you be so sure
14	when you're not so sure of anything, much anything else, how
15	can you be so sure that he wasn't 11?
16	THE WITNESS: I don't think there was 11 year olds
17	in the junior high school, but that's just an assumption on
18	my part, Your Honor.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Now you're sure that he was in
20	junior high school the first time that you had him in your
21	house, are you sure of that?
22	THE WITNESS: Yes.
23	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's his answer.
24	MR. OSHINSKY: Thank you, Your Honor. Now as you
25	testified you had sex with this particular child, C.Z., over

1	a number of years, correct?	
2	THE WITNESS: Yes.	
3	BY MR. OSHINSKY:	
4	Q And you would drive him around in your red	
5	Corvette, correct?	
6	A Sometimes.	
7	Q And on one of the days he came to you and asked you	
8	for a ride to his grandmother's house, is that correct?	
9	A No. I don't recall that at all.	
10	Q And my question is he asked for a ride to his	
11	grandmother's house but instead you took him to one of the	
12	transmitter buildings and tried to have sex with him, is that	
13	correct?	
14	A No.	
15	Q Are you aware that there is information in the	
16	record that says that the victim claims you tried to have sex	
17	with him in a transmitter building that you owned?	
18	A Yes, I believe I have seen that.	
19	Q You have seen it, okay. So I will refer just so	
20	the Court has a notation, it's EB, again, EB Exhibit 4 at Page	
21	29. And you drove with him to the transmitter building, is	
22	that correct?	
23	A I really can't I mean that whole period in my	
24	life is kind of a haze and I can't remember specific things	
25	from 27 years ago, I'm sorry.	

1	Q	But it's possible then that you did drive him to
2	the transm	nitter building?
3	A	C.Z.?
4	Q	Yes.
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	And is it possible that you also tried to have sex
7	with him t	here at the transmitter building?
8	A	No.
9	Q	And how do you remember that so specifically if you
10	took him	there and your memory is so bad as you just
11	testified.	
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	How do you know that you didn't have a
14	A	The only time that we had sex was at my house.
15	Q	And you are absolutely certain of that?
16	A	Yes.
17		JUDGE SIPPEL: Well how can you be so certain if
18	you can't	recall there, that it was too long ago? I mean if
19	you got f	oggy recollection it's a foggy recollection for
20	everything	ŗ .
21		(No audible response.)
22		JUDGE SIPPEL: All right, let's keep going.
23		Let's keep going. You got much more?
24		MR. OSHINSKY: One of your Yes, I do. Well, I
25	have a bit	more, yes, Your Honor.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Is there anybody here that
2	is going to be testifying that we are not going to get to?
3	MR. JACOBS: Well Dr. Duncan is here. We were
4	hoping we would at least begin with her testimony today, but
5	if not she'll be here tomorrow.
6	MR. OSHINSKY: We have made some arrangements with
7	our witness in Missouri just in the event that Dr. Duncan
8	didn't finish her testimony today.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: So what I am saying is for the sake
LO	of Dr. Duncan maybe she'll want to do something else than sit
L1	here and listen to this, maybe she wants to listen to this.
L2	Like we're going to just hold her up all afternoon? I mean
L3	I'm not trying to browbeat you, I'm just curious about an
L4	answer.
L5	DR. DUNCAN-HIVELY: Your Honor, it would be fine
L6	with me if I can be on call, we are staying not very far away,
L7	if that would be reasonable. I don't know how long this
L8	is the first one of these that I have, so I don't know how
L9	long they last, so
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: It's like a baseball game, you never
21	know.
22	MR. OSHINSKY: Well, Your Honor, unless At the
23	pace we are going I would say that unless Your Honor wants to
24	stay late it might be advisable.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, what's late by your standards?

25

1	MR. OSHINSKY: Five o'clock, after 5:00, I don't
2	know.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Five o'clock easy. We'll do 5:00.
4	MR. OSHINSKY: I'm fine with that time.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, 5:00, I can't go
6	MR. JACOBS: And I will have redirect after
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: I know. There's another day.
8	That's what is nice about three day trial, unless you're in
9	the third day. Yes, okay. You are certainly I don't think
10	we are going to call this witness today, do you?
11	MR. OSHINSKY: It doesn't look that way, Your
12	Honor, especially if Mr. Jacobs has redirect.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, okay, so when we finish with
14	him we'll close for the day and start tomorrow morning with
15	Dr. Duncan.
16	DR. DUNCAN-HIVELY: Thank you, Your Honor.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, very well.
18	MR. OSHINSKY: Okay.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, let's go.
20	MR. OSHINSKY: Now, Mr. Rice, one of your victims
21	was also a 9-year-old boy, is that correct?
22	THE WITNESS: No.
23	BY MR. OSHINSKY:
24	Q Are you aware that there is information in the
25	record that the victim's mother claims that this boy was nine

1	years old w	when you molested him?
2		(No audible response.)
3	Q	You are aware of the 9-year-old boy, aren't you?
4	A	In the record?
5	Q	Yes. You are aware of his existence, the 9-year-
6	old boy?	
7	A	No, I'm not.
8	Q	You're not aware that that is one of the
9	information	ns that you stipulated
10		(Simultaneous speaking.)
11	A	Right. We just didn't have nine year olds over at
12	the house.	
13	Q	So your answer is you are not aware that there was
14	a 9-year-ol	ld boy among the victims that you stipulated to?
15	A	Correct.
16		MR. OSHINSKY: All right. I would draw the Court's
17	attention t	to Page 31 of EB, again, of EB 4.
18		JUDGE SIPPEL: EB 4. Okay, I'm with you. Do you
19	have it, Mı	c. Rice?
20		THE WITNESS: Yes, I am looking at it.
21		JUDGE SIPPEL: Page 31?
22		THE WITNESS: Yes.
23		JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
24		MR. OSHINSKY: Page 31 towards the bottom of the
25	page it be	gins, this writer also interviewed Ms. Sharon

1	actually we shouldn't say the last name. Are you looking at
2	that Mr. Rice?
3	THE WITNESS: I am familiar with that name and that
4	person.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: It's the second to last paragraph?
6	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes, that's correct: This writer
7	also interviewed Ms. Sharon and her son, who remains a
8	juvenile, the juvenile stated that he was approximately nine
9	years of age when he and another juvenile first went over to
10	Mike's house in 1989.
11	I don't need to read the rest of it if Your Honor
12	and Mr. Rice will
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: No, it's not necessary.
14	MR. OSHINSKY: And having read that does that
15	refresh your recollection?
16	THE WITNESS: Yes.
17	BY MR. OSHINSKY:
18	Q And do you remember this 9-year-old?
19	A I knew who he is from the proceeding, but that was
20	the one that we testified earlier that nothing happened with
21	him.
22	Q So are you You are contesting the information
23	that's in this record?
24	A Yes.
25	JUDGE SIPPEL: In this paragraph of Page 31?

1	MR. OSHINSKY: In this paragraph?
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: You are contesting that?
3	(No audible response.)
4	MR. OSHINSKY: And yet you stipulated
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Wait, let me hear him answer.
6	MR. OSHINSKY: I'm sorry.
7	THE WITNESS: Yes, it didn't happen.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well then how can you remember that
9	it didn't happen here and those other places
10	THE WITNESS: Because that was the big thing when
11	we were doing it with the lawyers and they took depositions,
12	they did a lot of things, and it was bogus, and I think I
13	explained in the deposition what the motive was.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: You mean this deposition in this
15	case?
16	THE WITNESS: Yes.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Did you explain in the deposition
18	what the motive was?
19	THE WITNESS: Um-hmm.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's a yes?
21	THE WITNESS: Yes.
22	MR. OSHINSKY: And what did you believe the motive
23	was, Mr. Rice?
24	THE WITNESS: His uncle was a policeman with a
25	nearby police department and when you have a case that gets

1	some media	attention a lot of people that are not victims show
2	up, and thi	s person may have been at my house at one time, but
3	there was	not any of the things that he claimed happened
4	in the hous	se.
5		BY MR. OSHINSKY:
6	Q	But you recall that he was nine years old, correct?
7	A	No. I didn't know how old he was. He was only
8	there one t	time I believe. He came with someone else and left
9	with someor	ne else.
10	Q	But as with the other victim you can't
11	categorical	lly say that he wasn't nine years old, can you?
12	A	Well, I didn't check IDs.
13	Q	Right. So he could have been nine years old?
14	A	Well, he also could not have been nine years old.
15	Q	But the part about this recitation here you are
16	contesting	is not his age, it's what he alleges you did do
17	him?	
18	A	Yes, I am contesting that.
19	Q	Okay. And you are Even though you plead guilty
20	I'm sorı	cy, excuse me. You stipulated to facts that this,
21	what happer	ned here happened, is that correct?
22	A	Yes. And we explained why that was.
23	Q	And your suspicion was that this 9-year-old made
24	these alleg	gations because he was trying to get money from you,
25	is that con	creat?

1	A	That was the belief at that time.
2	Q	A 9-year-old was trying to get money from you and
3	that's why	he made these allegations?
4	A	No, the parents.
5	Q	The parents?
6	А	Yes.
7		MR. OSHINSKY: Okay.
8		JUDGE SIPPEL: Did you ever get sued for damages?
9		THE WITNESS: Yes, some of them.
10		JUDGE SIPPEL: You did? What, did you settle or
11	did you wir	n, or did you lose?
12		THE WITNESS: There was money put in a fund and
13	they all si	igned releases and they were paid money.
14		JUDGE SIPPEL: How much?
15		THE WITNESS: I can't disclose that, it was
16	confidentia	al.
17		JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, this is a court of law.
18		THE WITNESS: Okay.
19		JUDGE SIPPEL: You This is nothing This can't
20	be protecte	ed in a court of law, these numbers
21		MR. JACOBS: I'm not sure
22		JUDGE SIPPEL: but we can take that in camera.
23	I don't war	at to put this on the record. I'm trying to think.
24	I would li	ce to get Was there testimony taken?
25		THE WITNESS: Of the victims?

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Of anybody?
2	THE WITNESS: I don't believe so. I believe that
3	the lawyers put money in a universal fund and told the five
4	lawyers representing the victims they can divide it up any way
5	they wanted, so I am not sure who got what.
6	I have a recollection of the top amount of the
7	restitution that we made.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, aside from the amount, in
9	fact, I mean including the amount, I would like to see that
10	record in camera, because this may have some important
11	evidence in it. We are talking about the same events and the
12	record may show more than it appears.
13	He is having trouble with recollection, this is my
14	frustration. He can't remember, so maybe this will help.
15	MR. JACOBS: Was Toff the attorney?
16	THE WITNESS: Yes.
17	MR. JACOBS: He is deceased though, isn't he?
18	THE WITNESS: Yes.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Whose attorney was this guy you are
20	talking about?
21	THE WITNESS: Martin Toff.
22	MR. JACOBS: Mr. Rice's civil attorney.
23	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh. Is there anybody in his Did
24	he have a law firm or was it a sole practitioner?
25	THE WITNESS: He was with a law firm.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Still in practice? Is it is still
2	in business I mean, the law firm?
3	THE WITNESS: I think it's been merged several
4	times like law firms are. I'm not sure it's I may actually
5	have copies of the stipulations that they signed for the
6	money.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: There you go. When you can you have
8	them in? When can you get them to me?
9	THE WITNESS: Can I give them to Jerry and he can
10	forward them?
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: You can give You should
12	Everything you do should be submitted through counsel.
13	THE WITNESS: Okay. I may have them, if I can find
14	them.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: And that would be back home?
16	THE WITNESS: Yes.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Jacobs
18	THE WITNESS: I don't mind offering those.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: as an officer of the court I am
20	asking you try and get as complete of record together on that
21	if you can.
22	MR. JACOBS: Yes, Your Honor.
23	JUDGE SIPPEL: I will look at it in camera and
24	decide what to do with it, but I am entitled to see the
25	numbers as long as it's not on a public record.

1	THE WITNESS: Okay.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Go ahead, I'm sorry.
3	MR. OSHINSKY: Thank you, Your Honor. Now, Mr.
4	Rice, is it your belief that you were manipulated by these
5	boys who came to your home to have sex?
6	THE WITNESS: That's a compound question. Do I
7	believe I was manipulated by them?
8	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: If it's compound split it up.
10	MR. OSHINSKY: When they came to your home to have
11	sex and do you believe that you were being manipulated by them
12	when they did that, or some of the time?
13	THE WITNESS: Maybe, possibly, some of the times.
14	BY MR. OSHINSKY:
15	Q And did you tell
16	A I mean they were not invited. They knocked on the
17	door and I let them in.
18	Q And you felt that they were there to sort of bend
19	you to their will and get you to have sex with them?
20	A I don't believe that was their motive?
21	Q What do you believe their motive was?
22	A To visit and talk.
23	Q But you would often end up having sex with them
24	when they came over for those reasons, is that true?
25	A Some of them.

1	Q	Now, did you tell this to Dr. Duncan-Hively?
2	A ·	Yes.
3	Q .	And that's what she put in her report that these
4	boys were ma	anipulating, is that correct?
5	A ·	Yes.
6	1	MR. OSHINSKY: Your Honor, I apologize, could we
7	take a 5-mi	nute break? I am about to move into a different
8	subject here	e.
9		JUDGE SIPPEL: Let me just ask one question then.
10	Maybe this l	has been covered already, but what was the period
11	of time bety	ween your, as, what, how many years, between your
12	first act o	f sex and your being confronted by the police?
13		THE WITNESS: I would guess around five years.
14		JUDGE SIPPEL: Five years?
15		THE WITNESS: Yes.
16		JUDGE SIPPEL: And do you have any estimate as to
17	how many ti	mes you have had sex with children in that 5-year
18	period?	
19		THE WITNESS: No.
20		JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, can you give me a broad guess?
21		THE WITNESS: Um
22		JUDGE SIPPEL: Let's fill up the glass again.
23		THE WITNESS: Okay.
24		JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Assuming it's up at the top
25	is 1000 and	keep going down till you get to the number you are

1	happy with. I know you won't be happy with any number, but
2	THE WITNESS: I guess I didn't keep a record of
3	that and it's hard to say. Some of them it was one time and
4	others, with the one it was multiple times, the neighbor.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. So filling up the glass what
6	would you say, a quarter of the glass, half the glass?
7	THE WITNESS: What does a quarter I mean are you
8	trying to assign a number to that?
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, I'm trying to get something
LO	concrete that we can envision. As I said let's say a full
L1	glass would be 1000.
L2	THE WITNESS: Okay.
L3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Now take it from there, going
L4	from zero to 1000, if a full glass is 1000 half, obviously,
L5	that would be, a half glass is 500, and so far down the
L6	THE WITNESS: Okay. I think it would be the small
L7	glass total.
L8	JUDGE SIPPEL: I didn't say anything about the size
L9	of the glass.
20	THE WITNESS: Well, I mean
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: I just want Let's try it again,
22	okay.
23	THE WITNESS: Yes.
24	JUDGE SIPPEL: I don't care what size the glass is.
25	THE WITNESS: Right. But you want to know how full

1	it was?
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes. Assuming that it would take
3	1000, okay, 1000 trysts, and so if that's my assumption, so
4	if it was a half glass full that's 500, right, and a quarter
5	would be 250.
6	THE WITNESS: Okay.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: I am asking you which, what level
8	would it have been in
9	(Simultaneous speaking.)
10	THE WITNESS: It would be the bottom glass.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: The bottom of the glass?
12	THE WITNESS: Yes.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well that would be zero.
14	THE WITNESS: I thought you
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: The bottom of the glass is zero, the
16	top of the glass is 1000.
17	THE WITNESS: Okay.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: I am asking what is the range for
19	that glass that you had sex with these children?
20	THE WITNESS: I can guess on a number in the glass.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: If it's an educated guess that would
22	be fine.
23	THE WITNESS: Okay. I would guess with the
24	neighbor and everyone else, maybe 30 events, but that's only

a guess, 27 years ago.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Well, you're not suggesting						
2	it could have been 100, but you think it was 30?						
3	THE WITNESS: Right.						
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Right, what?						
5	THE WITNESS: I am not suggesting it's 1000 or 500						
6	or any of those high numbers.						
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: I realize that.						
8	THE WITNESS: Yes.						
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: But, I mean 30 is one number and you						
10	are testifying that you have a bad recollection anyway, but						
11	if it was 30 it could have been 60 since you don't recall.						
12	THE WITNESS: That's true.						
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.						
14	THE WITNESS: I mean that whole period of time was						
15	so long ago and part of my therapy was to paint some of that						
16	out of my mind.						
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, we'll have to come back on						
18	that.						
19	THE WITNESS: Okay.						
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Oshinsky?						
21	MR. OSHINSKY: All right. Your Honor, if Your						
22	Honor would allow us to take a break.						
23	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, yes.						
24	MR. OSHINSKY: I have one more question for Mr.						
25	Rice. Mr. Rice, when you were trying to assign numbers of						

1	times when you had sex with these children and you mentioned						
2	the number 30, is it possible that you had sex 30 times but						
3	in one year so that the total would be, for five years would						
4	be more than that?						
5	THE WITNESS: I really can't answer that because						
6	I don't recall.						
7	BY MR. OSHINSKY:						
8	Q Okay. But it is possible that 30 times is really						
9	just 30 times in a year and having done this over five years						
10	it could be a great deal more than that 30, isn't that true?						
11	A No. I think the one neighbor we talked about was						
12	fairly frequent and then the rest of them were maybe one time.						
13	Q And so fairly frequent would mean something like						
14	four or five times a week?						
15	A No, several times a week maybe.						
16	Q And that's every week, correct?						
17	A Yes.						
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: For how many years?						
19	MR. OSHINSKY: Five years, Your Honor.						
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Five years.						
21	MR. OSHINSKY: Okay. All right, Your Honor, if you						
22	would be kind enough to give us a break for five minutes I'd						
23	really appreciate it.						
24	JUDGE SIPPEL: Certainly.						
25	MR. OSHINSKY: Thank you.						

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Most of the 5-minute breaks last for					
2	ten minutes.					
3	MR. OSHINSKY: Ten minutes, okay.					
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: We're off the record.					
5	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the					
6	record at 2:48 p.m. and resumed at 3:05 p.m.)					
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Let's go back on the record. Mr.					
8	Rice, you're still under oath. Do you understand that?					
9	THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor.					
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Go ahead, Mr. Oshinsky.					
11	BY MR. OSHINSKY:					
12	Q Mr. Rice, is it your belief that you suffered from					
13	multiple personality disorder during the time period you					
14	molested these children?					
15	A I'm aware of that, yes.					
16	Q And that's something that was mentioned to you when					
17	you were being treated by Dr. Stillings, is that correct?					
18	A Yes. He made a diagnosis while I was in the					
19	hospital.					
20	Q In fact, he even had a name for that other					
21	personality. Is that correct?					
22	A Yes.					
23	Q And what was that name?					
24	A It was I think Little Mike, something like that.					
25	Q Okay. And so, the diagnosis of multiple					

1	personality means that you had more than one personality,							
2	correct?							
3	A Yes.							
4	Q And one of your personalities was responsible for							
5	molesting these children? Is that correct?							
6	A I don't know how to answer that.							
7	Q Yes or no?							
8	A Could you repeat the question?							
9	Q One of your personalities that you've just							
10	specified here, just now, was responsible for molesting the							
11	children in these cases. Is that correct?							
12	A Could have been, yes.							
13	Q I'm asking							
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: Is that the best you can do?							
15	THE WITNESS: Well, say yes then. Yes.							
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, no, no, no, no, no. No, no,							
17	no. Not unless you're sure it's yes.							
18	MR. OSHINSKY: It's starting							
19	THE WITNESS: I'm not really sure it's, I didn't							
20	realize I had the multiple personalities until a lot of							
21	testing and a lot of work with							
22	BY MR. OSHINSKY:							
23	Q But you realize it now, based on Dr. Stillings'							
24	findings?							
25	A Yes.							

1	Q Right?						
2	A Yes. Based on that now.						
3	Q Okay. And so, the answer to my question that one						
4	of your personalities was responsible for molesting these						
5	children is	s yes? Is that correct?					
6	A	Put that way, yes.					
7	Q	And do you still suffer from multiple personality					
8	disorder?						
9	A	No.					
10	Q	You got treatment for this condition from Dr.					
11	Stillings?	Is that correct?					
12	A	Yes.					
13	Q	You took medication for the condition?					
14	A	Yes.					
15	Q	And you underwent psychological therapy for the					
16	condition? Is that correct?						
17	A	Yes.					
18	Q	And now you believe that you're cured of multiple					
19	personality disorder?						
20	A	Yes.					
21	Q	And now you only have one personality?					
22	A	Yes.					
23	Q	And is the personality you have now the one that					
24	committed t	these sexual acts with the children?					
25	A	The personality I have now, no.					

1	Q	So, it's the other personality that was responsible						
2	for these sex acts with the children?							
3	A I believe so.							
4	Q Is that your testimony?							
5	A	A I'm not sure I ever divided it up in my mind.						
6	Q	Well, if you have to give a yes or no answer, and						
7	that's wh	at I'm asking you for, the answer is yes? Do you						
8	want me t	o repeat it?						
9	A	Please.						
10	Q	Is the personality that you now have the one that						
11	committed	these sexual acts with the children?						
12	A No.							
13	Q Are you still taking medication for this condition?							
14	A Yes.							
15	Q What medication are you taking for it?							
16	A Presently I'm taking Wellbutrin.							
17	Q	And that is for multiple personality disorder?						
18	A No. I think it's for, to overcome manic depression							
19	and depression.							
20	Q	Okay. I'm not talking about that. I'm only						
21	talking a	bout multiple personality disorder.						
22	А	I don't believe that's what it's for. I do not						
23	believe t	hat's what it's for.						
24	Q	Okay. So, the answer to my question, are you still						
25	taking me	dication for this condition would be no? Is that						

		298				
1	right?					
2	A For the multiple personality disorder?					
3	Q Correct.					
4	A	I would say, no.				
5	Q	Okay. Are you still getting psychological therapy				
6	for that di	isorder?				
7	A	No.				
8	Q	Are you now being treated for dissociative disorder				
9	at all?					
10	A	No.				
11	Q Are you now being, or you're not now being treated					
12	for bipolar affective disorder, correct? Is that correct?					
13	A Yes, no.					
14	Q Well, let me get					
15	A No. I got some					
16	Q Maybe my question was unclear.					
17	A	Okay.				
18	Q	You are not now being treated for bipolar effective				
19	disorder?	Is that correct?				
20	A That would be yes, not being treated.					
21	Q And what about dysthymia? Are you being treate					
22	for that?					
23	A	Is that depression?				
24	Q	That's my understanding of it. It's a mild form				

of depression.

		233				
1	A	Yes.				
2	Q So, you are being treated for that?					
3	(No audible response.)					
4	Q	And is that what you're taking the Wellbutrin for?				
5	A	Yes.				
6	Q	You are now only occasionally seeing a psychologist				
7	or a psych	iatrist? Is that correct?				
8	A	As needed.				
9	Q	And approximately how frequently is that?				
10	A	I haven't in several years.				
11	Q	You've not seen anybody in several years?				
12	A	Correct.				
13	Q	So, in terms of determining the frequency, would				
14	you say on	ce every two or three years?				
15	A I saw Dr. Stillings until possibly 2010 or 2011.					
16	Q And you haven't seen a mental health specialist					
17	since then?					
18	А	No.				
19	Q	And you did not see a mental health specialist				
20	until after you got arrested in this case?					
21	А	Correct.				
22	Q	You are not now being treated for alcohol abuse?				
23	Is that co	rrect?				
24	A	I'm not treated now, no.				
25	Q	In fact, you're drinking occasionally would				

1	probably be a violation of the rules of treating alcohol abuse
2	anyway. Is that correct?
3	A I don't think so.
4	Q Well, you said you've been to an Alcoholics
5	Anonymous meeting
6	A Yes.
7	Q while in prison. Do they allow their members
8	to take occasional drinks?
9	A No. You had to be complete sobriety. And I don't
LO	consider one drink once every couple of months with a Mexican
L1	meal is pertinent. It certainly hasn't triggered anything.
L2	Q Okay. But you are not now being, receiving any
L3	treatment for alcohol abuse, or attending anything like AA?
L4	Is that correct?
L5	A Correct.
L6	Q Did you ever tell Dr. Stillings that you had sex
L7	with children under the age of 14?
L8	A I believe so. He, we talked about all the victims.
L9	Q Didn't Dr. Stillings say in his report that if you
20	were having sex with a 13 year old, that in that case that
21	would be a sign of pedophilia?
22	A No.
23	Q He never said that in his report?
24	MR. OSHINSKY: Court's indulgence for just a

25

moment.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, sir.
2	MR. OSHINSKY: So, looking at EB Exhibit, official
3	exhibits this time, Exhibit 1, Page 20, the middle of the
4	page.
5	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: The second set of
6	MR. OSHINSKY: It's the second set, Your Honor.
7	It's not the
8	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: of the official
9	MR. OSHINSKY: directives. It's official notice
10	of it.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Official notice. Okay.
12	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes. And this is a report that's
13	attached to the application Mr. Rice sent to the Commission.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: I have it. What's the date of the
15	document?
16	MR. OSHINSKY: The date of the document? This is
17	Dr. Stillings' report dated
18	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: It's at Tab 1, further down
19	on the document.
20	(Simultaneous speaking.)
21	MR. OSHINSKY: This is the declaration.
22	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Let me just see.
23	MR. JACOBS: I think Mr. Oshinsky is
24	mischaracterizing what that
25	MR. OSHINSKY: I haven't characterized this at all.

1	Ιt	says	May	17th,	2001.
---	----	------	-----	-------	-------

- THE WITNESS: I've lost my place here. It's a
- 3 little hard --
- 4 MR. OSHINSKY: It's EB Official Notice Exhibit
- 5 number 1.
- 6 JUDGE SIPPEL: And what's the date of that exhibit?
- 7 MR. OSHINSKY: It's 2001. It's a declaration that
- 8 --
- 9 JUDGE SIPPEL: It's not a declaration. It's his
- 10 application.
- MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: It's the declaration that's
- 12 attached to the application.
- 13 JUDGE SIPPEL: May 30, 2014 is the application
- 14 date. That's what I have.
- MR. OSHINSKY: Yes. This is --
- 16 JUDGE SIPPEL: This is called application for
- 17 transfer of control.
- 18 MR. JACOBS: The report by Dr. Stillings is dated
- 19 May 17, 2001.
- 20 JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. I'm trying to keep this
- 21 straight.
- 22 We're struggling here to --
- 23 MR. OSHINSKY: Okay. It's Page 20 of the second
- 24 set of Exhibits. Each book is divided in half, more or less
- 25 in half. The first part is the direct case exhibit. There

1	should be a tab that says official notice exhibits.
2	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: And this is
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, I see. I got it here on Page
4	15. Declaration of Wayne Stillings?
5	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes. But it's, I'm going to read
6	from Page 20.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: And Page 20 of that, okay.
8	MR. OSHINSKY: Right. At about the middle of the
9	page.
10	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Okay. And if I could explain
11	for the record, Your Honor? This is the application at issue
12	in this case that was submitted by Patrick Sullivan to assign
13	a translator station to Lake Broadcasting.
14	This declaration of Mr. Stillings was attached as
15	an attachment to the original application received by Media
	an attachment to the original application received by Media Bureau. And that's just background for I think Counsel
16	
16	Bureau. And that's just background for I think Counsel
16 17 18	Bureau. And that's just background for I think Counsel will stipulate that that's what's going on here.
16 17 18 19	Bureau. And that's just background for I think Counsel will stipulate that that's what's going on here. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, as I understand, with document
16 17 18 19	Bureau. And that's just background for I think Counsel will stipulate that that's what's going on here. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, as I understand, with document though you have to be explicit on dates. This is different
16 17 18 19 20 21	Bureau. And that's just background for I think Counsel will stipulate that that's what's going on here. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, as I understand, with document though you have to be explicit on dates. This is different documents with different dates.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Bureau. And that's just background for I think Counsel will stipulate that that's what's going on here. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, as I understand, with document though you have to be explicit on dates. This is different documents with different dates. MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Correct. The application was

MR. OSHINSKY: It's actually in Lake's records as

25

_		
7	17.70	
	IW C I I	

- JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I don't want to confuse it any
- 3 more than it is. But where is the end of this? What page
- 4 does this go to?
- 5 MR. OSHINSKY: This report --
- 6 MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Stillings' declaration --
- 7 MR. OSHINSKY: -- goes to --
- 8 JUDGE SIPPEL: Stillings' declaration?
- 9 MR. OSHINSKY: Yes. Stillings' declaration is to,
- 10 it goes to Page 22. And I'm reading, I'm about to read from
- 11 Page 20.
- 12 JUDGE SIPPEL: Fair enough.
- MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: And so the record's clear,
- 14 Your Honor, Mr. Stillings has another letter --
- MR. OSHINSKY: It's actually doctor.
- MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: -- which is Page, it's 13 and
- 17 |14, which was in 2011. But the declaration was attached to
- 18 that letter to the Commission.
- 19 JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, I see.
- 20 MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: So, the dates, as Your Honor
- 21 was saying, we have to be careful with Stillings', because
- 22 there's the letter which attaches an earlier declaration.
- 23 JUDGE SIPPEL: I see. And so, your 2001 and 2011,
- 24 okay. I'm with you. I'm with you.
- 25 MR. OSHINSKY: All right, Your Honor, I'm about to

1	read from the paragraph. It's almost smack down in the middle
2	of the page.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: What page is that?
4	MR. OSHINSKY: Oh, Page 20.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. I thought I had that. Let
6	me just catch up, and then we'll go. Okay. I'm getting
7	there. Okay. Middle of Page 20?
8	MR. OSHINSKY: Right. There's a paragraph almost
9	in the, smack down in the middle of the page.
LO	JUDGE SIPPEL: What does it say?
L1	MR. OSHINSKY: It says, in part it says: As
L2	indicated, pedophilia is chiefly characterized by sexual
L3	attraction to and sexual activity with pre-pubescent children,
L4	generally 13 and younger. Mike Rice has never displayed the
L5	syndromatic elements of pedophilia.
L6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Do you have that place, Mr. Rice?
L7	THE WITNESS: Yes.
L8	JUDGE SIPPEL: You're with him? Okay. What's the
L9	question?
20	MR. OSHINSKY: The question that was pending was,
21	did you ever tell Dr. Stillings that you had sex with children
22	under the age of 14?
23	THE WITNESS: I'm sure I did. Because we went
24	through all of the people. And we, all of the scenarios
25	there.

1		BY MR. OSHINSKY:
2	Q	But having read this paragraph that I just read
3	from it ind	dicates that Dr. Stillings didn't know that you had
4	sex with 1	3 year olds, did he?
5	A	I believe he did.
6	Q	Isn't the import of this paragraph, Mike Rice has
7	never disp	layed the syndromatic elements of pedophilia?
8	A	Yes.
9	Q	So, that, one of those syndromatic elements which
10	he states	in the sentence before that is having sex with
11	somebody 1	3 or younger, isn't it?
12	A	I'm not sure that there's an age cutoff on that or
13	not.	
14	Q	Well, you're not a doctor. Dr. Stillings is the
15	doctor.	
16	A	Yes.
17	Q	Right. And he's stating categorically, the way I
18	read it, the	hat somebody who has sex with people 13 or younger
19	is a pedopi	hile.
20		MR. JACOBS: I object.
21		MR. OSHINSKY: And he is
22		JUDGE SIPPEL: What's the objection?
23		MR. JACOBS: That's not what he's saying.
24		JUDGE SIPPEL: I'll sustain the objection.
25		MR. OSHINSKY: I, that's

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'll sustain the objection. Let's
2	be more careful.
3	MR. OSHINSKY: Does Your Honor want me, I mean, my,
4	I think my construction is a common sense construction. As
5	indicated, pedophilia is chiefly characterized by sexual
6	attraction to, and sexual activity with pre-pubescent
7	children, generally age 13 and younger.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes. But there's too many
9	qualifiers. I mean, they're okay. But he's talking about
10	generally, you know.
11	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes. So, Your Honor, my question
12	is, did you tell Dr. Stillings that you were having sex with
13	someone under the age of 13?
14	MR. JACOBS: Thirteen or younger.
15	MR. OSHINSKY: Or 13 or younger, yes.
16	THE WITNESS: I believe the youngest victim was
17	probably 13. I'm not sure what I told him at that point. But
18	we took names, and talked about them and my relationships with
19	them, and my relationships with other people.
20	BY MR. OSHINSKY:
21	Q But the charging document that you stipulated to
22	says that you had sex with somebody under the age of 14?
23	A Correct.
24	Q Did you tell Dr. Stillings that you were charged
25	with a crime against, stemming from having sex with someone

1	under	the	age	of	14	?
_		70	7.7		_	. , .

- A Yes. I think he saw those documents.
- Q And do you feel that's consistent with what he wrote here? That you're not having sex with 13 year olds?
- 5 You're not attracted to them?
- 6 A I believe that's correct.
- 7 Q You think that's consistent with what I just read?
- 8 A I think it is. I mean, you know, you're getting
- 9 into definitions. And I'm not a doctor. I can't put
- 10 diagnoses on people.
- 11 Q All right. Well, let me ask you this question.
- 12 Dr. Stillings never treated you for pedophilia, did he? To
- 13 your knowledge?
- 14 A I'm not sure. He didn't say, well, I'm going to
- 15 treat you for this or that. And he wasn't specific.
- 16 Q I asked you a series of questions about the other
- 17 conditions you had. You knew all about that.
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q Okay.
- 20 A But he, I don't think he believed that that was a
- 21 concern --
- 22 Q Yes.
- A -- of him with me.
- Q But perhaps that's based on what you told him?
- 25 Isn't that true?

		309
1	A	Well, I think he looked at records too.
2	Q	What records did he look at?
3	A	The attorney furnished them.
4	Q	But you didn't give him any records, did you?
5	A	No.
6	Q	Okay. Thank you.
7		JUDGE SIPPEL: Do you agree with, let me ask this.
8	Do you agre	ee with Dr. Stillings' declaration of 2001?
9		THE WITNESS: Do I agree?
10		JUDGE SIPPEL: Did you hear my question? Do you
11	agree with	it?
12		THE WITNESS: Yes. I believe I do.
13		JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
14		THE WITNESS: Yes.
15		JUDGE SIPPEL: Did you, how much did you pay him
16	for this?	
17		THE WITNESS: The declaration? I'm not sure that
18	I did at al	1. We had sessions with him. And I can't remember
19	his hourly	rate. It wasn't cheap though. And he saw me when
20	I was in th	ne hospital, every day except Sunday.
21		JUDGE SIPPEL: Every day?
22		THE WITNESS: Every day, yes. And we had sessions
23	at that tir	me.
24		JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
25		THE WITNESS: Yes.

1		BY MR. OSHINSKY:
2	Q	Mr. Rice, you were aware of the allegations about
3	an 11 year	old, having sex with an 11 year old and with a 9
4	year old?	You were at least aware of those allegations?
5	Isn't that	correct?
6	A	Only in the documents in the hearing.
7	Q	But you were aware they existed? Is that correct?
8	A	From what Jerry showed me, yes.
9	Q	Were you aware of them at the time when you went
10	to your st	ipulated trial?
11	A	No. Because the
12	Q	No? But doesn't one of these stipulations concern
13	a 9 year ol	ld boy? Allegedly?
14	A	I think it was allegedly told to me 12. And that's
15	the one tha	at I denied. And we thought that before.
16	Q	And you were aware of the allegations about an 11
17	year old at	t that time, weren't you?
18	A	No.
19	Q	And so, did you tell Dr. Stillings about the
20	allegations	s about the 9 year old or the 11 year old?
21	A	No.
22	Q	Ever?
23	A	No. We talked about the 12 year old.
24	Q	A 12 year old?
25	А	Yes.

1	Q	But that's also under 13, is it not?
2	A	Yes, of course.
3	Q	Okay. I'm going to move on. During a polygraph
4	test in Jur	ne of 1996 you admitted to molesting children from
5	the time of	f your early 30's. Is that correct?
6		MR. JACOBS: Your date is wrong.
7		MR. OSHINSKY: Do I have the date
8		MR. JACOBS: The polygraph test.
9		MR. OSHINSKY: Yes. What's the date?
10		JUDGE SIPPEL: What exhibit is it?
11		MR. OSHINSKY: Oh, good point. Here. It's part
12	of Exhibit	4. And it's at Page 4.
13		Okay. I apologize, Your Honor, it's June 6, 2000.
14		THE WITNESS: Oh, yes.
15		MR. OSHINSKY: Page 4.
16		THE WITNESS: Yes.
17		JUDGE SIPPEL: Yarborough Polygraph Services?
18		MR. OSHINSKY: That's the one, Your Honor.
19		JUDGE SIPPEL: And it's dated, what's the date on
20	it?	
21		MR. JACOBS: There's no date. But there's a
22	reference	in Paragraph 1 to the test having been on June 6,
23	2000.	
24		JUDGE SIPPEL: I've got it. Okay. That answers
25	my question	n. Let's go.

1	MR. OSHINSKY: Okay. All right. So, you want me
2	to repeat the question?
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Please.
4	BY MR. OSHINSKY:
5	Q During a polygraph test in, this is in June 2000,
6	June 6, 2000, you admitted to molesting children from the time
7	of your early 30's. Is that correct?
8	A No.
9	Q All right. Would you look at the Exhibit that I'm
10	pointing to, Page 4. At the very bottom of Page 4 I'm reading
11	the last paragraph: Mr. Rice admits he has an extensive
12	history of inappropriate sexual interactions with teenage
13	boys. And he has had this interest dating back to his early
14	30's.
15	MR. OSHINSKY: He says he has had a good number of
16	victims over the years. And says the behaviors between he and
17	his victims were very much similar to those behaviors as
18	outlined in his conviction offense report.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Let's just stop with the early 30's,
20	that issue. I want to be sure that gets clarified. So,
21	what's the question?
22	MR. OSHINSKY: The question is, are you aware that
23	the information in the records is that you admitted to having
24	an extensive history of inappropriate sexual interactions
25	dating back to your early 30's? Are you aware of that

1	information in the record?
2	THE WITNESS: I'm reading it right here. Yes.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Do you agree with it?
4	THE WITNESS: No.
5	MR. OSHINSKY: But you agree that the person making
6	the report wrote that in his report? Is that correct?
7	THE WITNESS: It appears that way. But I didn't
8	say any of that.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: It speaks for itself. Let's move
10	on to the next question.
11	MR. OSHINSKY: And at your deposition, and again
12	I have to ask for the Court's indulgence for a second.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Certainly.
14	MR. OSHINSKY: At your deposition you told me that
15	it
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: Give us a page.
17	MR. OSHINSKY: Oh, I'm sorry. Well, that's what
18	I'm going to ask your indulgence for.
19	Your Honor, it begins on Page 30.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Thirty, 3-0?
21	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: This is the deposition?
23	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes.
24	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Why don't you just ask your
25	question?

1	BY MR. OSHINSKY:
2	Q Do you recall telling me that you thought that the
3	polygraph technician had recorded this because he mistook you
4	for someone else?
5	A Yes.
6	Q He confused you with someone else? And that's your
7	answer to, or that's your explanation for this notation in
8	this record?
9	A That's what I assumed. Because I never said
10	anything like that in that examination.
11	Q So, your testimony is you made no such admission
12	in this
13	A That is correct.
14	Q polygraph test? And your reasoning is that this
15	individual who, Mr. Yarborough, confused you with someone
16	else?
17	A That's what I theorized. Because he's kind of an
18	assembly line guy. He does those
19	Q Do you have some knowledge of him from before this
20	polygraph test?
21	A No. But I was told that he does that for probation
22	and parole. And he does it all the time.
23	Q But your testimony is he wouldn't keep proper
24	records? And he might confuse you with someone else?

It's possible. I don't know what records he keeps.

Α

25

1	I know what I didn't say.			
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Was he ever confronted by yourself			
3	or your attorney about this? Did you get the wrong person,			
4	Mr. Yarborough?			
5	THE WITNESS: No. It's a requirement when you're			
6	on probation and parole that you take a polygraph. And I took			
7	it and passed it.			
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, but if you think it's about			
9	the wrong person, wouldn't that give you pause?			
10	THE WITNESS: I didn't know this until way after			
11	the fact, that I saw this.			
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Way after the fact of you're taking			
13	the polygraph?			
14	THE WITNESS: Yes.			
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, I see that.			
16	THE WITNESS: Yes.			
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: You're saying that you found out			
18	that you passed the polygraph?			
19	THE WITNESS: He said that, yes. He said that.			
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: He said that to you? And that's			
21	THE WITNESS: He said that to me.			
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: the end of it? You weren't			
23	interested in anything more? He doesn't give you a copy of			
24	this report?			
25	THE WITNESS: No.			

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.			
2	MR. OSHINSKY: Your Honor, so I'd like you to turn			
3	to Page 5. And just to put a finish on this.			
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Where are we? Five of the exhibit?			
5	MR. OSHINSKY: Page 5. The same exhibit of the			
6	polygraph.			
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh.			
8	MR. OSHINSKY: The next page. The very next page.			
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm with you.			
LO	MR. OSHINSKY: All right. Reading just a couple			
L1	of lines from that. Question 5, Did you lie to me about the			
L2	manner in which you groomed your adolescent sex partner over			
L3	the years? Answer, No. Did you intentionally try to mislead			
L4	me about the number of your inappropriate sexual involvements			
L5	over the years? Answer, No. And he believed those answers			
L6	of yours were truthful. And that's why he told you you			
L7	passed.			
L8	THE WITNESS: That's right.			
L9	MR. OSHINSKY: But part of the basis of that is			
20	that you admitted to a much, much earlier pattern of molesting			
21	children?			
22	THE WITNESS: No. I didn't do that. And it was			
23	not part of the polygraph.			
24	MR. OSHINSKY: So, you believe the second page is			
25	correct, but the first page is incorrect? Is that right?			

1	That's what you're testifying to?
2	MR. JACOBS: Your Honor, this
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Wait
4	a minute. We've got a question outstanding. Go ahead.
5	MR. OSHINSKY: Well, that was the question, Your
6	Honor.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Do you understand the question?
8	MR. OSHINSKY: You're telling the Court that the
9	second page is correct, but the first page is incorrect?
10	THE WITNESS: Yes.
11	MR. OSHINSKY: Now, at the end of your parole
12	MR. JACOBS: Are we still on the letter?
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: No.
14	MR. JACOBS: All right. I'd like to say, this
15	letter is weirdsville.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: Which letter?
17	MR. JACOBS: If you look at it
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: You mean the Yarborough letter?
19	MR. JACOBS: The Yarborough letter. Because Page
20	1 has a description of what supposedly was said at the lie
21	detector test. Page 2 then takes out of context two
22	questions, Question 5, and Question 7. What happened to all
23	the other questions?
24	MR. OSHINSKY: Your Honor
25	(Simultaneous speaking.)

1	MR. OSHINSKY: The first page is an interview. And
2	the second page is what the technician finds was the result
3	of the test. So, it's a pre-test interview. And as, Your
4	Honor will hear some explanation about how this is done. I
5	do have one more question.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: You've got redirect time to do that,
7	Mr. Jacobs. Let's go.
8	BY MR. OSHINSKY:
9	Q Mr. Rice, isn't it true that in fact you were
LO	referred for this polygraph because the treatment providers
L1	at the Department of Corrections believed that you had been,
L2	you had a more extensive history of offending than you were
L3	admitting to? Isn't that the reason you were referred for
L4	this polygraph?
L5	A No, it's a standard thing they do with all people
L6	that are on supervision.
L7	Q Okay. And at the end of parole you have another
L8	standard polygraph test, which is set up for you? Is that
L9	correct?
20	A That is correct.
21	Q And you did not take that second polygraph test?
22	A That is correct.
23	Q So, one would think that having such a big
24	disagreement with the report from the first polygraph test you
25	would be anxious to take a second polygraph test where you

1	could clear the matter up.		
2	A	I didn't see this report until after I was off of	
3	parole.		
4	Q	But taking that second polygraph test was part of	
5	your conditions of parole, was it not?		
6	A	Yes.	
7	Q	Yet, you did not take it?	
8	A	I did not.	
9	Q	All right.	
10		JUDGE SIPPEL: Does that mean you violated the	
11	terms of your parole?		
12		THE WITNESS: No. We had a discussion with Dr.	
13	Stillings. And he wrote a letter saying he didn't think it		
14	would be in the best interest of my treatment to take that		
15	test. And a polygraph examiner will not give a test if a		
16	doctor wri	tes the statement.	
17		JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, who did he write the letter	
18	to?		
19		THE WITNESS: The polygraph guy.	
20		JUDGE SIPPEL: You mean Yarborough?	
21		THE WITNESS: Yes.	
22		JUDGE SIPPEL: Do we have a copy of that letter?	
23		THE WITNESS: I don't.	
24		JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, that's interesting. Who does?	
25		THE WITNESS: I don't know.	

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well wouldn't you I'm interested		
2	in seeing that letter. This was with my		
3	THE WITNESS: That would be, then ask one of the		
4	expert witnesses at the enforcement bureau, is it true that		
5	if a medical person doesn't want their client to take it, the		
6	polygraph operator will not give it to him?		
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes.		
8	THE WITNESS: And that was the case in this		
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: What I'm trying to find out, who was		
10	it that, was this Dr. Stillings that wrote that letter?		
11	THE WITNESS: Yes. Stillings, yes.		
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. So, why aren't we getting the		
13	letter from Dr. Stillings?		
14	MR. JACOBS: He's dead.		
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, is there somebody that has his		
16	records?		
17	MR. JACOBS: Not as far as we know.		
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, then I have no basis to		
19	believe that explanation. I don't, there's no basis. The		
20	0 man's dead.		
21	MR. JACOBS: There's also no basis for saying that		
22	there was a second, supposed to be a second test.		
23	JUDGE SIPPEL: He's, the witness says that there		
24	was supposed to be one. But he got out of it because the		
25	doctor wrote a letter.		

1	MR. JACOBS: Well, it seems to me the Bureau of
2	Corrections, Department of Corrections ought to have a
3	notation about whether there would be parolees have taken the
4	test or not taken the test.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, have you sought to get that?
6	MR. JACOBS: No.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, do you think, could you
8	undertake to do that, please?
9	MR. JACOBS: Okay.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: I want Dr. Stillings', a copy of Dr.
11	Stillings' letter, or a notation to that effect. Go ahead.
12	MR. OSHINSKY: Okay. I have just a couple more,
13	Your Honor. Mr. Rice, you currently have friends where you
14	live, where you reside?
15	THE WITNESS: I have boarders there.
16	BY MR. OSHINSKY:
17	Q Just boarders? You don't have any friends there?
18	A Well, I consider them friends.
19	Q You have a number of people who wrote reference
20	letters for you? Is that correct?
21	A Yes.
22	Q You don't describe them as friends?
23	A Oh, I believe they're friends, people that I know
24	either through business or through different activities I'm
25	involved with. One of them came from an officer in our

1	neighborhood.		
2		JUDGE SIPPEL: What do you mean, an officer?	
3		THE WITNESS: He's secretary of our corporation.	
4		JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh.	
5		THE WITNESS: The neighborhood.	
6		JUDGE SIPPEL: He's not a police officer?	
7		THE WITNESS: Oh, no. No.	
8		JUDGE SIPPEL: You threw me off there. Go ahead,	
9	sir.		
10		MR. OSHINSKY: I didn't mean to interrupt.	
11		JUDGE SIPPEL: No. Yes. Go, go.	
12	BY MR. OSHINSKY:		
13	Q	Are you also friendly with your neighbors?	
14	A	Yes.	
15	Q	And your friends around your residence trust you?	
16	Is that co	rrect? They trust you?	
17	A	Yes.	
18	Q	In fact, one of your friends trusts you enough to	
19	let you take care of his underage children? Is that correct?		
20	A	No.	
21	Q That's not correct?		
22	A No. That's not correct.		
23	Q So, you have not in fact taken care of any of your		
24	friends' or neighbors' children?		
25	A	That is correct. Now, you want me to explain it?	

1	Q	No, no.
2	A	One of the letters there
3	Q	No, no.
4		JUDGE SIPPEL: Wait, wait. Wait for your
5	question.	
6		MR. OSHINSKY: I'm sorry, Your Honor. I have to
7	ask for you	r indulgence. And actually, this is the last I'm
8	going to	
9		JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, I get asked a lot.
10		(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
11	record at 3	3:39 p.m. and resumed at 3:39 p.m.)
12		MR. OSHINSKY: According to Mr. Karan, he
13	occasional]	y left his children with you, under your watch
14		JUDGE SIPPEL: What are you reading from?
15		MR. OSHINSKY: while he was working. Oh, I'm
16	sorry. I a	apologize, Your Honor. This is one of the letters
17	that Lake i	s offering, which Your Honor talked about
18		JUDGE SIPPEL: Right.
19		MR. OSHINSKY: this morning.
20		JUDGE SIPPEL: Right. That's
21		MR. OSHINSKY: And, oh, yes
22		JUDGE SIPPEL: What tab is that?
23		MR. OSHINSKY: I'm sorry. It's Lake Broadcasting,
24	I think it	s Exhibit 3, Appendix C. Is that right?
25		Exhibit 1, Appendix C.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Yes, I've got it.			
2	MR. OSHINSKY: So, it's the fifth letter, Your			
3	Honor. It's dated November 24th, 2014.			
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Who's the sender of the letter?			
5	MR. OSHINSKY: John Adam Karan.			
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.			
7	MR. OSHINSKY: And in this letter			
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. I got it.			
9	MR. OSHINSKY: He states that he has occasionally			
10	left his children under Mr. Rice's watch while he was working,			
11	or had other issues regarding his new company. Now			
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Where is that line?			
13	MR. OSHINSKY: That's about in the middle of the			
14	paragraph, the second paragraph.			
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Would you repeat it again,			
16	where it shows up?			
17	MR. OSHINSKY: It says			
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: After consulting my wife?			
19	MR. OSHINSKY: No: The children grew to like him,			
20	and never were in any danger around Mike. I trusted him with			
21	them, and occasionally left the children under his watch while			
22	I was working on other issues regarding our new company. Now,			
23	having heard that, Mr. Rice, is your recollection refreshed?			
24	THE WITNESS: Yes.			
25	BY MR. OSHINSKY:			

1	Q And so, you have taken care of underage children?
2	A No. They were in the work, the vicinity. I had,
3	I wasn't taking care of them. This was a job site that Mr.
4	Karan was at, and I was at. And I think his kids, they
5	weren't real little. But they were there. And he and his
6	wife also worked there. And they had no concern with them
7	being around me, is what I believe he meant.
8	Q So, he left you alone with his underage children?
9	Is that correct?
10	A I was not alone. I was with some other workers.
11	Q Let me just read one sentence before that: After
12	consulting with my wife we decided to allow our children to
13	have communication and interaction with Mike. This proved to
14	be appropriate and healthy for our children. The children
15	grew to like him, and never were in any danger around Mike.
16	I trusted him with them, and occasionally left the children
17	under his watch while I was working on other issues.
18	Didn't he leave his children with you, alone with
19	you?
20	A No. I think he was on the premises, probably in
21	the office doing things. We were trying to get this business
22	going.
23	JUDGE SIPPEL: That doesn't mean that you were not
24	alone with the children though.
25	THE WITNESS: I was never alone by myself with

-	. 1		
1	them.	No,	sır.
_	CHEIII.	INO,	$D \perp \perp \cdot$

- JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, usually that's the way it
- 3 goes, alone by yourself.
- THE WITNESS: I was not. I don't know what, how
- 5 they characterized it --
- 6 MR. OSHINSKY: He said he left them under your
- 7 watch. That sounds to me like he left them, left you to take
- 8 care of his children.
- 9 THE WITNESS: I wasn't taking care of them. They
- 10 were just there.
- 11 MR. OSHINSKY: The Court's indulgence for one last
- 12 minute. That's all I have, Your Honor.
- JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, what does he say? He says,
- 14 after consulting with my wife we decided to allow our children
- 15 to have communication and interaction with Mike.
- 16 I don't know, whatever interaction is.
- 17 This proved to be appropriate and healthy for our
- 18 children. The children grew to like him, and never were in
- 19 danger around Mike. I trusted him with them, and occasionally
- 20 left, occasionally left the children under his watch while I
- 21 was working on other issues regarding our new company.
- 22 It clearly, I clearly read that to say that he
- 23 allowed you to be entrusted with the children alone. He might
- 24 have been in the other room. But you were with the children
- 25 alone. That's what he's saying. Plus he says it right there.

1	I mean, it's because it's English. No?
2	THE WITNESS: That's what he says. But I don't
3	recall any occasion I was alone
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, you don't recall anything.
5	I'm not going to worry about that. This is dated November
6	24th, 2014.
7	MR. JACOBS: Your Honor, I object.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Why?
9	MR. JACOBS: The word alone does not naturally flow
10	from saying under his watch.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Occasionally left the children under
12	his watch. Well, to me it does. Because if it was not alone
13	he would have qualified the sentence that way. There would
14	have been other people with him.
15	But he says, unequivocally, that he left the
16	children under his, Mr. Rice's, watch while I was working on
17	other issues. I'm going to interpret that as meaning alone.
18	But, so is this, are you finished with these letters?
19	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes, Your Honor.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Somehow or other these, all
21	these letter writers, they got your name okay, but they
22	misspelled my name.
23	THE WITNESS: Oh, no.
24	JUDGE SIPPEL: How did that happen? Were they in

a room together and --

1	THE WITNESS: No, no, no.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: everybody gets a form to fill
3	out?
4	THE WITNESS: No. I'm sorry that they misspelled
5	your name. I didn't notice.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: All of them did, every single one
7	of them. That leaves me to suspect something. Not something
8	bad. Okay. Let's go. What do you have next?
9	MR. OSHINSKY: Your Honor, just let me All
LO	right, Your Honor. No. I have nothing more of this witness.
L1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Redirect?
L2	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
L3	MR. JACOBS: Thank you, Your Honor. I'm a little
L4	perplexed about how to make some of the points which I would
L5	like to make. And they don't necessarily involve the
L6	testimony by Mr. Rice. But let me try.
L7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, just keep trying. Keep going.
L8	MR. JACOBS: Just let me try.
L9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Do something. Because you're not
20	doing anything when you talk like that.
21	MR. JACOBS: Okay. There was a lot of time spent
22	earlier today trying to understand the meaning of the report
23	that
24	JUDGE SIPPEL: Which report are you talking about?
25	Exhibit 4?

1	MR. JACOBS: I'm getting to it, please. The report
2	by Mr. Braun.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. What's that Exhibit number?
4	MR. JACOBS: It's the Well, let me go back
5	farther than that. The question arose about the second
6	amended information which was the bureau's exhibit.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: What number?
8	MR. JACOBS: It's 10, Your Honor.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. That's what I thought. Go
10	ahead.
11	MR. JACOBS: And
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: What page?
13	MR. JACOBS: Well, it seems to me there was the
14	overall question of, what was the significance of this whole
15	thing? What kind of proceeding was there? And I just wanted
16	to
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, why don't you just ask him the
18	question? You don't have to have all this explanation.
19	MR. JACOBS: Well, I'm going to make sure that he
20	has all the
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, he'll
22	MR. JACOBS: information here.
23	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, we don't know until you ask
24	the question. We don't have time.
25	MR. JACOBS: Okay.

Τ	JUDGE SIPPEL: Let's go.
2	MR. JACOBS: Okay. Mr. Rice, turning to the second
3	amended information, which describes the 12 counts of the
4	indictment, what is your understanding of the kind of court
5	proceeding that was held?
6	THE WITNESS: As it was described to me by legal
7	representation, that it's better not to have an evidentiary
8	trial on a case like this. Instead we should do a stipulation
9	which a judge, I'm sure will find you guilty of the
10	stipulation. And he stipulated to I believe what the victims
11	would say if they were called to testify. I believe, I don't
12	have that document. But I did hear it was something like
13	that.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, that's the one that they have
15	the names redacted. But anyway, go ahead.
16	THE WITNESS: No, this was, Your Honor, this was
17	the sentencing document that had that. And it
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Am I missing something? You're
19	nodding yes.
20	THE WITNESS: Yes.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. So, what am I missing?
22	Anybody know?
23	MR. JACOBS: There was a different document, which
24	was the sentencing document. But the point is
) E	TUDGE SIDDEL. Woll IId like to find out Dut go

1	ahead. We'll come back to that. So, what's your point?
2	MR. JACOBS: So, at the end of this proceeding the
3	judge did what?
4	THE WITNESS: He said, Mr. Rice, we find you guilty
5	as per the stipulation.
6	MR. JACOBS: Okay. The other document that I'm
7	referring to is Page 23 of the Bureau's Exhibit 4.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Before we pass on to that, since we
9	have Exhibit 10 now in front of me, I want to just note the
10	memorandum. It's called, well, I'm not going to give the
11	name. But it's a memorandum.
12	And it says that, the parties agree that if certain
13	witnesses were called to testify in this case. Their
14	testimony would be as set forth herein. The defendant
15	that's you specifically does not admit that any of the
16	testimony is true, or that any of the acts took place.
17	The expected testimony is set out herein by count,
18	and said counts are in reference to the counts as set forth
19	in the second amended information filed by the state in this
20	case. The state and defendant submit this cause to the Court
21	with the following being a stipulation as to what the
22	testimony would be.
23	Which testimony? You don't admit that any of it's
24	true? Well, according to this document. You want to see it?

THE WITNESS: No. I've seen it.

25

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: So, what do we have there? What is
2	that? What do we have?
3	THE WITNESS: Well, that went before the Judge.
4	And
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: No, I know. It seems to be a local
6	procedure
7	THE WITNESS: Yes.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: in Missouri. But anyway, you
9	ended up pleading guilty to that, or you were found guilty of
10	that, by virtue of this stipulation? I believe it's the
11	latter.
12	THE WITNESS: I believe it is the latter. But
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: It is the latter, okay.
14	THE WITNESS: But
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: So, you've been convicted of all
16	these counts?
17	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Then we have nothing to argue
19	about. Let's go.
20	MR. JACOBS: So, in Bureau Exhibit 4, Page 23,
21	which has been spoken of a lot today, there is a short memo
22	dated September 27, 1994, from Timothy Brawn. And
23	JUDGE SIPPEL: He's the prosecuting attorney for
24	St. Charles County?
25	MR. JACOBS: Right. And I wanted to provide the

1	context for that. This is a pre, as it says, please see
2	attached pre-sentence investigation. This is a pre-sentence
3	memo.
4	MR. OSHINSKY: Your Honor, I just want to know one
5	thing. Mr. Jacobs is actually offering testimony here, rather
6	than
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: I know. I'm getting too much of
8	that. He's proffering what he wants What is the point that
9	you want to establish?
10	MR. JACOBS: That that's what this is. That this
11	is a document which
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: It speaks for itself. It speaks for
13	itself.
14	MR. JACOBS: Speaks for itself.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: So, that's it.
16	MR. JACOBS: But it's important to recognize the
17	dates involved.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: I, okay. What date are we talking
19	about, September 27th, 1994?
20	MR. JACOBS: Right.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's the only date I see.
22	MR. JACOBS: And September 30 is when Mr. Rice
23	began his prison sentence.
24	JUDGE SIPPEL: You're not, you're testifying to it.
25	Vou!re not even asking your witness when did you begin your

1	you know. You know how it goes. When did you begin your
2	sentence, or your incarceration? Was it September 1, 2, 3?
3	THE WITNESS: Thirty days after the sentence was
4	given.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Thirty days after let's, well
6	MR. JACOBS: Okay.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Can you do anything with that, Mr.
8	Jacobs?
9	MR. JACOBS: No. I think it just clarifies for the
10	record what this document is.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes. I understand that. But I
12	don't see any
13	MR. JACOBS: I thought that
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: He's saying that it was 30 days
15	after the action on the stipulation. Is that right?
16	THE WITNESS: That is correct.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: And I'm saying it's September 27,
18	1994. Does that jive? I mean, does that correlate?
19	MR. OSHINSKY: Your Honor, if I could point out
20	that this says, please see attached pre-sentence
21	investigation. This is pre-sentence.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: So, you can't read that Page 23
23	without reading what comes after it. Am I right?
24	MR. OSHINSKY: The pre-sentence report could have
25	been all right. Yes. It could have been earlier. All we

1	know is that at some point a petition or a motion was made for
2	early release in this case. And this was the state's
3	response.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, you know
5	MR. JACOBS: That's where
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: This is not the best record I've
7	ever seen.
8	MR. JACOBS: That's where things get confused.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, don't tell me what I should
10	know. What's going on here? You got, now you're talking
11	about a Page 23, which is a very short paragraph, okay. So,
12	we've established these dates. You said it was just for
13	establishing dates. We have the dates. Now, can you go to
14	the next question? Because, well, just before.
15	MR. JACOBS: What I was trying to point out is that
16	this is not an early release document. This is a pre-
17	sentencing document.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well
19	MR. JACOBS: Despite whatever it may say.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: We don't want your testimony, Mr.
21	Jacobs.
22	MR. JACOBS: All right.
23	JUDGE SIPPEL: We don't want that.
24	MR. JACOBS: Well, fine.
25	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, if you want to ask questions,

1	I'm here to listen to the questions.
2	MR. JACOBS: All right. I'll go on to certain
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you.
4	MR. JACOBS: questions.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you.
6	MR. JACOBS: Mr. Rice, there has already been some
7	testimony on your part concerning your use of alcohol. But
8	I would like just to clarify this with a few more questions.
9	Are you an alcoholic?
10	THE WITNESS: No, sir.
11	MR. JACOBS: Do you drink at all?
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Asked and answered.
13	THE WITNESS: Yes.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: Let's go. Next question.
15	BY MR. JACOBS:
16	Q And do you keep liquor at home?
17	A No.
18	Q When did you stop regular drinking?
19	A Oh, many years ago. Because the medicine that Dr.
20	Stillings prescribed, if you had alcohol it would make you
21	very sick.
22	Q And, but you have said that occasionally you do
23	take a drink. Can you please expound on that a little bit?
24	A Yes. I like Mexican food. And we have some good
25	ones in St. Louis. And they have delicious Margaritas. And

1	I will have one Margarita with my Mexican food and burritos.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. He's already testified to
3	that.
4	MR. JACOBS: And that's the extent of your
5	drinking?
6	THE WITNESS: That is the extent of it, yes.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Move on.
8	MR. JACOBS: Next. Are you mentally ill?
9	THE WITNESS: I'm not.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: I was going to say, what do you mean
11	by that question? But that's your question. You live with
12	it.
13	MR. JACOBS: Can you briefly describe your periods
14	of treatment, beginning with Barnes?
15	THE WITNESS: Okay. Barnes Hospital, I was put
16	into a psychiatric unit and
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: What year was this?
18	THE WITNESS: That would be, what, I guess 1991,
19	just shortly after the arrest.
20	MR. JACOBS: Right.
21	THE WITNESS: I was there for a period of six
22	months. And we had, Dr. Stillings visited six days a week.
23	And we had sessions to treat those disorders that I had at
24	that time. And discussed the case. I think at one time there
25	was a staff psychologist that saw me several times.

1	MR. JACOBS: And reference is made to 84 sessions
2	with Dr. Stillings. Can you tell us what that is?
3	THE WITNESS: Okay. After I was released from
4	prison I voluntarily continued treatment with Dr. Stillings.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: What year was that?
6	THE WITNESS: End of 1999.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: So, the first reference is to 1990-
8	1991. And now you're back to '99? Is that right? We're
9	talking about eight years lapse?
10	MR. JACOBS: With prison in between.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: I understand that. I'm just trying
12	to follow the timeframe.
13	MR. JACOBS: Okay.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: Go ahead.
15	MR. JACOBS: And so, when you were released from
16	prison at the end of 1999, you continued your treatment with
17	Dr. Stillings?
18	THE WITNESS: Yes.
19	MR. JACOBS: And also, what else? Another program?
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: No, no. You stop with the what
21	else.
22	THE WITNESS: I attended a post-release program
23	with a Dr. Robinson.
24	MR. JACOBS: Mark Lee Robinson?
25	THE WITNESS: Mark Lee Robinson.

1		BY MR. JACOBS:
2	Q	And how long did that last?
3	A	Until almost the end of my parole period.
4	Q	So, in other words, like a year and a half
5	A	Yes, something like that.
6	Q	to two years? There has been or will be
7	testimony o	criticizing that period. Can you tell me what you
8	understand	what the problem was?
9		JUDGE SIPPEL: With Dr. Robinson now?
10		MR. JACOBS: Yes.
11		JUDGE SIPPEL: What did he treat you for?
12		THE WITNESS: Well, it was for sex offender and
13	group thera	apy, and anger management, things like that.
14		JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
15		THE WITNESS: It was, the program was a 12 week
16	introduction	on. And then there were once-a- week sessions for
17	a year, yea	ar and a half.
18		JUDGE SIPPEL: This is after you got out of prison?
19		THE WITNESS: Yes.
20		JUDGE SIPPEL: And this was probably one of the
21	conditions	of your parole? Is that right?
22		THE WITNESS: Yes.
23		BY MR. JACOBS:
24	Q	And it had been signed off on by your parole
25	officer?	

1	A Yes. It was, they had a list of therapists that
2	you could go to. And it was fairly close. And selected him.
3	Q But lo and behold, at almost the end of this two
4	year period or so, what happened?
5	A I don't know the terminology. But the probation
6	and parole didn't think he had the proper credentials to
7	continue on with this treatment, even though they had approved
8	them in this other thing. So, they terminated his ability to
9	do that sort of program for the Department of Probation and
10	Parole, to my understanding.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Who picked up where Dr. Robinson
12	left off?
13	THE WITNESS: I was to go search for a new group.
14	But I was only about a month or so away from being released.
15	And by the time I had visited and been interviewed, the time
16	had elapsed. So, I didn't really join a group at that time.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
18	MR. JACOBS: Now, Your Honor, I mention this phase
19	because there is a reference in the direct testimony that we
20	may receive tomorrow from Tammy
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, you're talking about something
22	that's not in the record.
23	MR. JACOBS: Right.
24	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm not going to allow that.
25	MR. JACOBS: So, after you completed that post

1	release course in 2002, what further treatments did you have?
2	THE WITNESS: I would see Dr. Stillings about once
3	a month. He'd review the medications, and review my progress.
4	MR. JACOBS: And then, in October
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, wait a minute. Were those
6	regular visits? Or were those visits directed by the parole
7	officer?
8	THE WITNESS: No. It was voluntary.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: So, this was just regular
10	THE WITNESS: Yes.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: your regular doctor in a sense?
12	THE WITNESS: Yes. Well, he was
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: It's all right. Let's
14	THE WITNESS: treating on the
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: move on. That's enough.
16	THE WITNESS: issues that I had.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes.
18	THE WITNESS: And I
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: I don't mean to cut you off. But
20	that clarifies it for me. I'm sorry, Mr. Jacob.
21	MR. JACOBS: So, those continued. And then in
22	October 2011 you asked Dr. Stillings to write an updated
23	report, a follow-up report. And
24	JUDGE SIPPEL: You know, you're supposed to ask the
25	witness, what did he do next? What happened next? You're not

1	supposed to be putting your own testimony in the record.
2	MR. JACOBS: Okay.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
4	MR. JACOBS: And he produced a letter, right?
5	THE WITNESS: Yes.
6	MR. JACOBS: And what did the letter say? The
7	letter is found at Lake Exhibit 1, Appendix D.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Hold on.
9	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Your Honor, this is the
10	letter we objected to.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes.
12	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: And coming in for any kind
13	of truth. Because the guy, the witness is dead.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: Right. And do you have a copy of
15	this letter? The witness doesn't have a copy of the letter.
16	THE WITNESS: I have seen it.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, that's not enough.
18	THE WITNESS: It's in the
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's not enough.
20	THE WITNESS: Okay.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: You got to know what the man's
22	talking about. And okay. Recognizing that Dr. Stillings is
23	dead, and can't be cross examined about what he wrote, what
24	is your question?
25	MR JACOBS: What does Dr Stillings conclude about

1	your mental well-being?
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: We got it right in the document.
3	The document says what it is.
4	MR. JACOBS: Well, please read the first sentence.
5	MR. OSHINSKY: Well, apart from that Your Honor,
6	our objection is about the conclusions in here.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: I realize that.
8	MR. OSHINSKY: Because he can't
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes.
10	MR. OSHINSKY: Okay. He can't
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: I realize that. So, I don't know
12	why we're spending any time on this. Dr. Stillings is dead.
13	If they wanted to bring him in to cross examine him, they'd
14	have to dig him up. Let's go on.
15	MR. JACOBS: All right. The subject matter of this
16	application is an FM translator station.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Can the witness tell us that? All
18	right. Never mind.
19	MR. JACOBS: This is the applicant.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: You're giving background. Go ahead.
21	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Does this go anything on the
22	cross? Or is this a new matter that wasn't in his direct?
23	MR. JACOBS: I am trying to lay the foundation for
24	a, this exhibit, which we may wish to introduce later on in
25	this proceeding. But since the sponsoring person is Mr. Rice.

1	I think this is the right time to at least identify this
2	exhibit, and
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, wait a minute. Is Mr. Rice
4	going to be here throughout this hearing?
5	MR. JACOBS: Yes.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Or does he go back tomorrow, or
7	something like that?
8	MR. JACOBS: No. He
9	THE WITNESS: I'll be here for a couple of days.
10	Maybe not all of it. But
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well
12	THE WITNESS: I think for several days.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Not all of it? Not all if it you
14	don't think? You don't think you're going to be here for all
15	of it?
16	THE WITNESS: Well, it should be over with Friday.
17	And that's when I'm planning to
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh. So, wait until the appropriate
19	time. We may be able to stipulate it in. Talk to counsel
20	about it. I don't want to waste any time on it now. Next
21	question.
22	MR. JACOBS: The, Your Honor himself asked the
23	question how it is that Mr. Rice's medical mental situation
24	could possibly be related to the sexual misconduct issues.
25	And that

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm going to let the expert tell me
2	about that. I've heard enough about that. I'm finished with
3	that.
4	MR. JACOBS: Well, that is, at least one expert,
5	Dr. Stillings, testified to that very point in one of his
6	reports. And I wanted to
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, Stillings, I don't have too
8	much faith in what Dr. Stillings wrote at this stage of the
9	game. But I will permit it in. I would suggest that you put
10	it in your post findings.
11	MR. JACOBS: In the cross examination by the Bureau
12	there was an extensive discussion about the trips that Mr.
13	Rice took with C.Z., in particular to the broadcast stations,
14	with particular reference to transcript Page 101.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Of the deposition?
16	MR. JACOBS: Of the deposition.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
18	MR. JACOBS: And I would just like to clarify this
19	point with Mr. Rice.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Well, ask him a question
21	then.
22	MR. JACOBS: Occasionally
23	JUDGE SIPPEL: 101?
24	MR. JACOBS: 101.
25	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Let me get to it. I think

1	you, don't you have the deposition there?
2	MR. JACOBS: No, It's
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: It's under the seat.
4	(Simultaneous speaking.)
5	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: We have another copy.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: No. It's right under the packet of
7	documents there, 101. Okay. So, get it in front of you, Mr.
8	Rice. If I can find 101. Let me see. Oh, I see. It's
9	farther. There we go.
10	MR. JACOBS: Line 15, Mr. Rice testified, C.Z. once
11	in a while would go over to the station with me when I had to
12	pick up something. Correct, Mr. Rice?
13	THE WITNESS: Yes.
14	MR. JACOBS: Now, perhaps I misheard, but it seemed
15	to me that during the extended colloquy on this question of
16	visiting broadcast stations, or station, that's what happened.
17	The singular and the plural got mixed up. And this perhaps
18	one visit by C.Z. to one station became
19	MR. OSHINSKY: Your Honor, I'm
20	MR. JACOBS: May I finish asking my question?
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: No. Because he has to interrupt you
22	before you get it on the record.
23	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes, I
24	JUDGE SIPPEL: He's leading, it's a leading
25	question.

1		MR. OSHINSKY: It's not just that. I mean, I think
2	he's instr	acting his client in the answer.
3		JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I'm not going to go that far.
4	It's leadir	ng. Rephrase the question.
5		MR. JACOBS: Transcript 101 refers to
6		JUDGE SIPPEL: He knows what it refers to. He
7	knows what	it refers to. It's going to the station with C.Z.
8		MR. JACOBS: Right.
9		JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Now, what's your question?
10		MR. JACOBS: Were there other youngsters who went
11	with you to	that same station or other stations?
12		THE WITNESS: Not that I recall.
13		MR. JACOBS: So, this testimony relates only to a
14	single your	ngster?
15		THE WITNESS: Yes.
16		JUDGE SIPPEL: It's C.Z.
17		MR. JACOBS: C.Z. Okay.
18		JUDGE SIPPEL: Next question.
19		MR. JACOBS: Your Honor, can I describe, or ask the
20	witness to	describe the station which is the subject of this
21	application	1?
22		JUDGE SIPPEL: Why don't you just ask him a
23	question?	Would you describe for us the station that you're
24	applying fo	or?
25		THE WITNESS: It is a piece of equipment that

1	translates the signal from a different station. It's called
2	a translator. And a translator picks up, is delivered a
3	signal from either AM or FM station, and re-broadcasts on a
4	different frequency at low power.
5	MR. JACOBS: So, in this case
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Now, there is the first time today
7	that I have heard a clear, specific answer. Good going, Mr.
8	Rice. Good going. Let's go. Next question.
9	BY MR. JACOBS:
10	Q So, in this case what is the station that is being
11	re-broadcast or translated?
12	A Well, it could be any, almost any station. This
13	has become very popular to have translators now for secondary
14	programming. And it's, the FCC has allowed AM stations to re-
15	broadcast their AM programming on a low power FM translator
16	to get them coverage at night, and improve their coverage.
17	Q And that is the, what is currently being done. You
18	know the call sign of the station which is currently being
19	translated by the FM translator station?
20	A I believe it's W, I think 238, and then there's
21	several letters.
22	Q Well, W238CE is our translator?
23	A Yes.
24	Q But what AM station is it re-broadcasting?
25	A It's WRBZ in Montgomery, Alabama.

1	MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Your Honor, I think this is
2	in the application, and it goes beyond the scope of our cross
3	examination. It seems to me that if he wanted much of this
4	in it should have been in as direct testimony to begin with.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: How much more do you have, Mr.
6	Jacobs?
7	MR. JACOBS: I'm just about done, Your Honor.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Then just about complete.
9	Now, is that it?
10	MR. JACOBS: Maybe. But just give me a moment,
11	please. Okay. I'm finished.
12	MR. OSHINSKY: Your Honor, I have just a couple of
13	questions.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: That, on redirect, I mean
15	MR. OSHINSKY: On recross actually.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, okay. But it's only with
17	respect to the redirect testimony?
18	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes. Yes, Your Honor.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
20	RECROSS EXAMINATION
21	BY MR. OSHINSKY:
22	Q Mr. Rice, you testified about your use of alcohol.
23	And in your direct testimony, or I'm sorry in your, actually
24	on cross examination you testified that you had been diagnosed
25	as having, suffering from alcohol abuse. Is that correct?

1	A	Correct.
2	Q	And that is different from alcoholism, is it not?
3	A	I don't know.
4	Q	Isn't it a more severe form of alcohol dependency
5	than alcoho	olism?
6	A	I don't know.
7		JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, you got three concepts today.
8	You went fi	com abuse to dependency, and alcoholism. Is there
9	any differe	ence between any of them?
10		THE WITNESS: There might be.
11		BY MR. OSHINSKY:
12	Q	But the treatment you received was for alcohol
13	abuse. Is	that correct?
14	A	Well, it was about drinking, excessive drinking.
15	Q	And at the time you received it you were on
16	medication	which really prevented you from drinking? Is that
17	correct?	
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	And you are not on that medication anymore, are
20	you?	
21	A	No.
22	Q	So, there's nothing preventing you from drinking
23	at this pos	int? Is that correct?
24	A	No medically.
25	Q	And just one last question. You testified already

1	that Dr. St	cillings did not treat you for pedophilia. Is that
2	correct?	
3	A	I don't know. I mean, there was so many treatments
4	in there,	I'm not sure.
5	Q	Well, you testified very clearly about the other
6	disorders	that you suffered from, bipolar
7	A	I don't remember anything specifically about that.
8	Q	Okay. So, you did not receive sex offender
9	treatment :	from Dr. Stillings? Is that correct?
L ₀	A	No. I did.
L1	Q	You did? What form did that take?
L2	A	Well, it was about the crimes I did. And there was
L3	definitely	sex offender treatment.
L4	Q	But, Mr. Rice, in his report Dr. Stillings
L5	specifical	ly states that he didn't consider you to be a
L6	pedophile.	Is that correct.
L7	A	That's what it says in here.
L8	Q	So, if he wouldn't be giving
L9		JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, do you agree with that? Or
20	is it just	written there?
21		THE WITNESS: I agree I am not.
22		BY MR. OSHINSKY:
23	Q	You agree you are not?
24	A	A pedophile.
25	Q	So, there was no reason for Dr. Stillings to be

1	giving you sex offender treatment when he believed that your
2	sex offending was due to other mental conditions? Isn't that
3	correct?
4	A He gave me treatment on sex offending and
5	prevention on that.
6	Q But wasn't that related to your other mental
7	conditions, such as bipolar effective disorder, and dysthymia,
8	and so forth?
9	A I suppose it all was tied in.
10	Q Isn't that his conclusion, that your sex offending
11	is a result of those mental disorders?
12	A Yes. He believed that was it.
13	MR. OSHINSKY: That's all, Your Honor.
14	MR. JACOBS: Your Honor, if I may? I think that
15	last set of questions was confusing. Because
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, the record will explain that.
17	It's either confusing, or it can be understood. We're not
18	going to garble it up any more. So, let's call it a day.
19	Okay?
20	MR. JACOBS: You're the boss.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I'm the boss. But if you have
22	a specific No. I'm going to stop it right here and now.
23	What time is it there?
24	MR. OSHINSKY: It's 20 after 4:00 p.m., Your Honor.
25	MR. DEVILLE: Twenty after 4:00 p.m. And you've

1	been on the stand a good part of the day. And you've been a,	
2	you look like you're a happy warrior. So, we'll	
3	THE WITNESS: I wouldn't say I'm a happy warrior.	
4	It's very stressful.	
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, just listen to me. You're not	
6	to talk about your testimony with any of the special, any of	
7	the witnesses, particularly the expert witnesses. You can	
8	certainly consult with counsel about the case. But we may	
9	want to call you back at some point.	
10	So, I just want to be careful, that's all. So, I'm	
11	not going to release you from your oath. No, I am going to	
12	release you from your oath. We'll swear you in again if we	
13	need you. Okay. So, you can eat dinner tonight and not have	
14	to worry about that. Okay?	
15	THE WITNESS: Thank you.	
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: Do you understand me? But you're	
17	going to be around?	
18	THE WITNESS: Yes, I'll be around for a few days.	
19	I'm planning to.	
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Jacobs? We're set?	
21	MR. JACOBS: Fine.	
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: We're in recess until tomorrow	
23	morning at 10:30 a.m.	
24	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the	
25	record at 4:20 p.m.)	

<u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u>

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Patrick Sullivan and Lake Broadcasting

Before: Federal Communications Commission

Date: 05-03-17

Place: Washington, DC

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Court Reporter

near Nous &